

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER
GUSTAV GRUENBAUM W. KURRELMMEYER
RAYMOND D. HAVENS

CONTENTS

	PAGE
SCHWARTZ, W. L.—A Study of Amy Lowell's Far Eastern Verse,	145
SNYDER, E. D.—Poe and Amy Lowell,	152
KURRELMMEYER, W.—Doppeldrucke von Wielands 'Auserlesenen Gedichten,'	153
MICHAUD, G. L.—The Spanish Sources of certain Sixteenth-Century French Writers,	157
GREEN, O. H.—Sources of Two Sonnets of Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola,	163
ANDREWS, A. L.—Old Norse Notes,	166
ZEYDEL, E. H.—'Sturm und Drang' once more,	171
HILLHOUSE, J. T.—The Man of Taste,	174
KRAPPE, E. S.—A Note on Chaucer's Yeoman,	176
SAVAGE, H. L.—A Note on 'Parlement of the Thre Ages' 38,	177
WARREN, F. M.—Was Balzac's 'Illusions Perdues' influenced by Stendhal?	179
SHANKS, L. P.—A Note on Baudelaire,	181
RAYSOR, T. M.—Coleridge Marginalia,	182

REVIEWS:—

H. R. PLOMER and T. P. CROSS, The Life and Correspondence of Lodowick Bryskett. [<i>E. Greenlaw.</i>]	183
A. CARNOY, La Science du Mot. [<i>C. H. Grundgent.</i>]	186
H. WALKER, English Satire and Satirists. [<i>R. C. Whitford.</i>]	187
F. B. LUQUIENS, Introduction to Old French Phonology and Morphology. [<i>H. G. Doyle.</i>]	190
R. LEVY, The Astrological Works of Abraham Ibn Ezra. [<i>U. T. Holmes.</i>]	193
SÁNDOR KÉMÉRI, Rambles with Anatole France. [<i>J. M. Carrière.</i>]	194
Acta Philologica Scandinavica. [<i>S. Einarsson.</i>]	196
H. W. NORDMEYER, Eduard Fitzgeralds <i>Rubaiyat des Omar Khayyam</i> . [<i>A. W. Boesche.</i>]	197
H. N. HILLEBRAND, The Child Actors; T. W. BALDWIN, The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company. [<i>G. F. Reynolds.</i>]	199
G. C. L. SCHUCHARD, Studien zur Verskunst des jungen Klopstock. [<i>E. Feise.</i>]	202
K. UHLER, Die Bedeutungsgleichheit der Altenglischen Adjektiva und Adverbia mit und ohne <i>-lic</i> (<i>-lice</i>). [<i>M. Callaway, Jr.</i>]	203
MARY A. WYMAN, Two American Pioneers—Seba Smith and Elizabeth Oakes Smith. [<i>C. J. Weber.</i>]	204
R. D. FRENCH, A Chaucer Handbook; G. H. COWLING, Chaucer; W. C. CURRY, Chaucer and the Mediaeval Sciences; K. SISAM, Chaucer: <i>The Nun's Priest's Tale</i> . [<i>P. F. Baum.</i>]	206
E. B. REED, Songs from the British Drama. [<i>H. T. Perry.</i>]	207
R. H. HILL, The Shelley Correspondence in the Bodleian Library. [<i>W. E. Peck.</i>]	208
J. F. BENNE, Anglo-Dutch Relations from the Earliest Times to the Death of William the Third. [<i>R. Turner.</i>]	210
E. PONS, Swift, Les années de jeunesse et le <i>Conte du Torneau</i> . [<i>H. M. Dargan.</i>]	211
BRIEF MENTION	211

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year — Single Copy (Current) Seventy-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

EDITED BY

H. Carrington Lancaster, Gustav Gruenbaum, W. Kurrelmeyer,
and Raymond D. Havens

ADVISORY EDITORS

D. S. Blondheim, G. Chinard, E. Feise, J. C. French, E. Greenlaw,
K. Malone, J. Robles, R. B. Roulston, L. P. Shanks

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is
\$5.00 for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other
countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the
Editors of Modern Language Notes, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins
Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

SPECULUM

A JOURNAL OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

EDWARD KENNARD RAND

MANAGING EDITOR

FRANCIS PEABODY MAGOUN, JR.

PUBLISHING EDITOR

JOHN NICHOLAS BROWN

In SPECULUM appear articles and notes on all phases of mediaeval
thought and life.

SPECULUM is sent free to members of the Academy.

Libraries and institutions may subscribe at five dollars annually.

For further information, apply to the Executive Secretary,

THE MEDIAEVAL ACADEMY OF AMERICA

LEHMAN HALL

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

the
kins

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLIII

MARCH, 1928

Number 3

A STUDY OF AMY LOWELL'S FAR EASTERN VERSE

... the West is the East, with the puritan night
Swallowed up in a gush of approaching daylight
At least, so our cherished delusion mistakes it,
And since everything is as man's attitude makes it,
What the Orient knew we are learning again.

Amy Lowell, *A Critical Fable*.

After the appearance of *East Wind* and *Ballads for Sale*, two posthumous volumes of poems by Amy Lowell, it now seems possible to attempt a special study of her treatment of Far Eastern themes from the point of view of a student of comparative literature. In this place, I propose to discuss the genesis of her interest in these motifs, to make a running commentary upon her Far Eastern poetry, to show how far her art was influenced by the Japanese and Chinese poets, and to indicate her merits as an interpreter of the Far East.

For the past fifteen years, an interest in the poetry of China and Japan has been characteristic of the "new poetry movement." At first thought it may appear strange that a group of poets who preferred to experiment with the forms of free verse should concern themselves with the rigidly syllabic poetry of the Japanese or the rimed stanzas of the Chinese. But as these modern poets were partly intent upon writing poetry in the syntax of prose, they naturally found special satisfaction in the newer prose translations from the Chinese and Japanese, while they remained almost uninfluenced by the artificial versification that strikes those who read this poetry in the original. For as a matter of fact, this new school of poets thought that Far Eastern poetry had a real kinship to "the picture making of the modern poet."

As in the case of most of the American poets who have heard the call of the Far East, as I have shown in a recent article,¹ many reasons of a personal character may be given to explain Amy Lowell's interest in the Far East. It will be remembered that her brother Percival Lowell was for some years resident in Korea and Japan,² that Japanese were frequent guests in the Lowell home, that Boston is a centre for the study of Far Eastern art, and that Mrs. Florence Ayscough, who later collaborated with Amy Lowell on *Fir-Flower Tablets*, a series of translations from the Chinese, was a girlhood friend. Indeed, Amy Lowell's deeply-rooted appreciation of Japanese art is shown by two poems, "A Coloured Print by Shokei" and "A Japanese Wood-Carving," found in her first book, *A Dome of Many-Coloured Glass* (1912).

After this literary début (at the age of thirty-six), Amy Lowell went to London in 1913, where she fell in with a group of writers who were then cultivating an acquaintance with Chinese and Japanese poetry and art, under the influence of British scholars. This was the year of Tagore's first visit to the West. Amy Lowell met Ezra Pound in London and was influenced by him, I believe. Pound, the inventor of the name "Imagist," was also the literary executor of Ernest Fenollosa, who left unpublished several manuscripts concerning the Japanese Nō drama, and many notes on Chinese poetry. These essays and translations appealed strongly to Pound, and he perhaps communicated his enthusiasm for Far Eastern poetry to Amy Lowell. I know that when the London Imagists published their first booklet, *Des Imagistes* (April, 1914), Pound was represented therein by several paraphrases from the Chinese.

Yet Miss Lowell was slow in attempting to express herself in the manner of the Japanese poet or painter. In her next books, *Sword Blades and Poppy Seed* (1914) and *Men, Women and Ghosts* (1917), the only thing that is specifically Japanese is perhaps the perspective of some of the landscapes or some of the imagery. In her lectures called *Six French Poets* (1915), she

¹ See "L'Appel de l'Extrême-Orient dans la poésie des États-Unis," *Revue de littérature comparée*, Jan. 1928.

² He was the author of four books on the Far East: *Chōsen* (1885), *The Soul of the Far East* (1886), *Notō, an Unexplored Corner of Japan* (1891), and *Occult Japan* (1895).

did not enlarge upon Francis Jammes's curious interest in China, nor is there anything definitely Japanese in the anthologies entitled *Some Imagist Poets*, which she published for the re-organized Imagist school in 1915, 1916 and 1917, except the series of "Lacquer Prints" to be found in the last volume, which were reprinted in *Pictures of the Floating World*, 1919.

From 1916 to 1919, however, Miss Lowell grew more interested in Japan. Her acquaintance with the art and thought of that country was at first decidedly superficial, if it be judged by her special praise, in her *Tendencies in Modern American Poetry* (1917), of John Gould Fletcher's lines entitled "A Young Daimyo," of which she wrote (p. 339): "This to an occidental mind certainly has the charm of Japan.

When first he came out to meet me,
He had just been girt with the two swords;
And I found he was far more interested in the glitter of their hilts
And did not even compare my kiss to the cherry blossom."³

There is a greater fund of accurate information in Amy Lowell's poem on Commodore Perry's expedition to Japan, entitled "Guns as Keys; and the Great Gate Swings" (*Seven Arts* for August, 1917, now to be found in *Can Grande's Castle*, 1918). The parts of the poem that tell of the movements of Perry's squadron are written in "polyphonic prose," while the passages in cadence depict scenes in Japan at that date. In this poem, as it seems to me, Amy Lowell adopted the technique, not of the Japanese poet, but of the Japanese designer of color prints or painter of illustrated scrolls,—the *makimono*. In support of this assertion, let me adduce the evidence that several lyrics in this poem are manifestly verse reproductions of well known color prints. The often quoted lines:

At Mishima in the province of Kai,
Three men are trying to measure a pine-tree
By the length of their out-stretched arms

(*Can Grande's Castle*, p. 51)

³ Young daimyo in feudal Japan were first girt with two swords at a much more tender age, nor was kissing practiced at that time. Fletcher's cherry blossom simile is incorrect and foreign to Japanese thought.

are an exact reproduction of one of Hokusai's "Thirty-Six Views of Fuji."⁴

But the publication of her fifth volume of poetry, *Pictures of the Floating World*⁵ (1919), showed Amy Lowell as now adopting "the *hokku* pattern" for certain of the poems called "Lacquer Prints." The volume also contains seven "Chinoiserie," "written in a quasi-Oriental idiom." Indeed, as the preface said, many of these poems also "owe their inception to the vivid colour-prints of the Japanese masters."⁶ Here again, two poems are once more reminiscent of Edmond de Goncourt's prose.⁷ But of the 59 compositions in the Japanese series, only seven are cast in the tripartite arrangement that is characteristic of the *hokku*. Perhaps this was the reason why the Japanese poet Jun Fujita, writing in the columns of *Poetry* (June, 1922, p. 164), was led to say that Amy Lowell "missed the essential quality of the Japanese in her *hokkus*." I also hear many false notes in this pseudo-Oriental

⁴ I was startled to discover that Miss Lowell's verses on the geisha dance of a Corean Ambassador (p. 66) contain some striking verbal reminiscences of Edmond de Goncourt's description of one of Utamaro's most elaborate works:

The beautiful dresses
Blue, Green, Mauve, Yellow;
And the beautiful green pointed hats
Like Chinese porcelains

(. . . ces femmes coiffées d'étranges chapeaux pointus verts, où le bleu, le vert, le mauve, le jaune rappellent la décoration des porcelaines chinoises. E. de Goncourt, *Utamaro*, def. ed., p. 17).

Amy Lowell had difficulty with foreign proper-names at times. Cf. in "Guns as Keys" p. 57, *Sanno* for *Sano*; p. 70, *Taketani Sabai* (?); and *Arimitsu* cloth(?); p. 88, plum-trees of *Kingawa* (query, *Kanagawa*?).

⁵ This title translates the Japanese word *ukiyo-e*, a popular name for the realistic colored prints.

⁶ Miss Lowell, in her introduction to the *Diaries of Court Ladies of Old Japan*, translated by Annie S. Omori and Kochi Doi (1920), confessed that "many of us live in daily communion with Japanese prints." This essay, by the way, is an excellent outline of Japanese history and literature, in which, as my Japanese friends tell me, Miss Lowell's insight enabled her to make some remarkable characterizations.

⁷ Compare the poem "Document" (p. 10), with E. de Goncourt's *Hokousai* (def. ed., p. 180), and the poems "At the Bookseller's" (p. 109) with Goncourt's *Utamaro* (def. ed., p. 144).

poetry, and I have found that when critics praise these "Lacquer Prints" they always select the same four or five pieces for our admiration.

Disregarding chronology for a moment, in order to complete the study of the Japanese themes in Amy Lowell's work, I call attention to the attempt that she made to adopt the strict *hokku* metre of 5, 7 and 5 syllables in a suite called "Twenty-Four Hokku on a Modern Theme" which appeared in *Poetry* for June, 1921, and was later included in *What's O'Clock* (1925). This volume also contains a later poem entitled "The Anniversary," which has all of its twenty-four stanzas in the *hokku* metre. To me, it seems that these poems reveal more Japanese influence than all the rest of Amy Lowell's work, since the adoption of a foreign form of verse surely marks a deeper, more vital influence than the mere poetical interpretation of an Eastern work of art or the re-telling of a legend. Miss Lowell's Far Eastern writings, up to this time, may be fairly called a "Free Fantasia on Japanese Themes," to borrow the title which she herself gave to one of her earlier poems. Now at last she made a supreme and final effort to forget herself and write original verse like a Japanese poet, and this with a fair measure of success.

Miss Lowell's life of John Keats and a plan to revise for publication the translations which Mrs. Ayscough proposed to make from Chinese poetry began to absorb the poet's attention about 1918. The first of Amy Lowell's versions, then called "Chinese Written Wall Pictures," appeared in *Poetry* for February, 1919, and were incorporated in the volume called *Fir-Flower Tablets*, published in December, 1921. As a part of her preparation for this work, she had read extensively about China,⁸ and she was perhaps thus led to compose "A Legend of Porcelain," published in the *North American Review* for March, 1920, and now to be found in *Legends* (1921). I am not fully competent to criticize this poem in its details, nor inclined to do so after reading Amy Lowell's preface, where she said: "That inaccuracies from the point of view of the student of folk-lore have crept into the poems, I have no doubt, nor does it make any difference to me."

⁸ Preface to *Legends*, p. ix: "I will not enumerate other books on China which I have read. Indeed, I could not, they are so many."

Her collaboration with Mrs. Ayscough led Miss Lowell to the adoption of a special theory for the rendering of Chinese poetry which is stated in the Introduction to *Fir-Flower Tablets* and in Mrs. Ayscough's article "Amy Lowell and the Far East" in the *Bookman* for March, 1926. In a word, this was to express in English, whenever the rhythm allowed, the component parts of the pictographs found in the Chinese texts. This method of translation leads inevitably to some questionable interpretations,⁹ for which it seems that Amy Lowell was herself responsible. For instance, the Chinese character meaning "green" is also regularly applied to blue objects. But whenever a Chinese poet thought of the blue skies, Miss Lowell and Mrs. Ayscough make him speak of "green heavens." *T'ien shan*, a common Chinese phrase, refers to the celestial mountains, suggesting their purity, and not to any "heaven-high hills" with a suggestion of altitude. In practice, therefore, their theory of literal or pictural analysis of the Chinese character merely intensifies the latent queerness of these versions. Another criticism, made by a competent judge, is that there is "too much pomp and color" in Miss Lowell's renderings.¹⁰

One regrets especially that *Fir-Flower Tablets* do not give a better idea of Chinese poetical form. Miss Lowell stated in her preface that she had "as a rule, strictly adhered" to the lines of the original stanza, and yet she allowed herself much liberty in this respect "solely in the interest of cadence." Professor Pelliot and the Chinese critic Hsin-Hai Chang also point out that some of the poems were not placed by Mrs. Ayscough in the mouth of the proper speaker.¹¹ Thus, as Archibald Macleish so aptly put it, "Nowhere in the book does one come upon that spurious air of similitude which in portrait painting produces the impression, even upon those who do not know the original, that the picture

⁹ Cf. Witter Bynner, "On Translating Chinese Poetry," *Asia*, Dec. 1921; "to drag out from an ideograph its radical metaphor lands you in a limbo-language." Miss Lowell's theory is also latent in Fenollosa's essay on "The Chinese Written Character," which was published by Pound in the issues of the *Little Review* for 1918.

¹⁰ Witter Bynner, in the article quoted above.

¹¹ See Pelliot's review in *T'oung Pao*, 1922, pp. 232-244, and H. H. Chang, "The Vogue of Chinese Poetry," *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1922, pp. 99-114.

is an excellent likeness. These translations are poems, they are as much Miss Lowell's as they are Li T'ai Po's."¹²

Let me now take up the more general subjects of influence and esthetic doctrines. In my new book on *The Far East in Modern French Literature*,¹³ I have shown that, roughly speaking, the older interpreters of the Far East approached their subject through only one channel, by the help of books, through the Eastern arts, or by travel in the Orient. Amy Lowell's approach was not so simple. If she found the materials for her Chinese writings in books and manuscripts, her Japanese poems are usually suggested by Japanese art though it is easy to see that she made frequent use of the many books on Japan. I feel sure that Amy Lowell's familiarity with Japanese art greatly stimulated her tendency towards innovation in poetry and the acceptance of new esthetic standards. We know that she considered, with John Gould Fletcher, that the modern poets are more and more indebted to the Japanese for a realization of the value of psychological suggestion.¹⁴ Her general method of poetical composition became curiously like the technique of the Japanese painters of "pictures of the floating world," a school which is famous for skill in design and pattern-making. A list might easily be prepared of the motifs common to Amy Lowell and to this school of Japanese art, including, for instance, the willow tree, the peony, cats and fire-works. Curiously enough, three-fourths of these very motifs are entirely absent from classical Japanese poetry. On the other hand, as a New Englander, Amy Lowell could not forget to commemorate, in such poems as "Lilacs" and "Meetinghouse Hill," the China trade of her forefathers. But the Chinese influence was far weaker, for she was seldom moved to the composition of such fragments after the Chinese manner as "Wind and Silver."¹⁵ One cannot but

¹² Archibald Macleish, "Amy Lowell and the Art of Poetry," *No. Amer. Rev.*, March, 1925, p. 520.

¹³ W. L. Schwartz, *The Imaginative Interpretation of the Far East in Modern French Literature, 1800-1925*. Bibl. de la Rev. de Litt. comparée, Champion, Paris, 1927.

¹⁴ Cf. Amy Lowell, *Tendencies in Modern American Poetry*, p. 337, and Royall Snow, "Poetry in Borrowed Plumage," *New Republic*, Feb. 9, 1921, p. 312-5.

¹⁵ See *What's O'Clock*, pp. 68, 82 and 221.

regret therefore that Amy Lowell could not visit the Far East when we compare some of the renderings in *Fir-Flower Tablets* and the *hokku* in *What's O'Clock* with her earlier "Chinoiserie" and "Lacquer Prints."

In conclusion, it seems to me that Amy Lowell is less important as a mere interpreter of the Far East than as a propagandist, practitioner and theorizer who drew attention to the poetry and art of China and Japan, as she chose to do even in writing her life of John Keats (see Vol. II, pp. 41-2 and 248). "She had a genius for catching the public eye," she called herself in her *Fable*,

a modern White Knight
Forever explaining her latest inventions,

and if we ever graft Far Eastern branches upon the stock of English poetry, we will turn back to Amy Lowell's Oriental verse with the gratitude and respect due to an inspired explorer.

WILLIAM LEONARD SCHWARTZ.

Stanford University.

POE AND AMY LOWELL

Students of versification, and in particular of rime, may be interested to note that one of the special features of Miss Lowell's "polyphonic prose"—indeed, the only feature of any importance—was specifically anticipated by Poe. In the Preface of *Can Grande's Castle* Miss Lowell wrote a defense of rime at unexpected intervals, which is the principal characteristic of her "polyphonic prose."

Rhyme is employed to give richness of effect, to heighten the musical feelings of a passage, but it is employed in a different way from that usual in metrical verse. For, although the poet may, indeed must, employ rhyme, it is not done always, nor for the most part regularly [in "polyphonic prose"]. In other words, the rhymes should seldom come at the end of the cadences, unless such an effect be specially desired. This use of rhyme has been another difficulty to readers. Seeing rhymes, their minds have been compelled by their seeming strangeness to pull them, Jack-Horner-like, out of the text and unduly notice them, to the detriment of the passage in which they are imbedded. Hearing them read without stress, they pass unobserved, merely adding their quota of tonal colour to the whole.

Poe's lucid statement of the same view is to be found at the end of his history of the development of rime. In "The Rationale of Verse" (Virginia Edition of Poe, xiv, p. 229) we find these exact words:

It would require a high degree, indeed, both of cultivation and courage, on the part of any versifier, to enable him to place his rhymes—and let them remain—at unquestionably their best position, that of unusual and *unanticipated* intervals.

A careful study of the two passages in their respective contexts simply confirms the impression that the two poets were working towards identical theories of rime. For a fuller discussion of the matter by Poe, with his comment on the unexpected rime in line fourteen of "The Raven," see his article in *Graham's Magazine* for March, 1846 (Virginia Edition, xvi, p. 84).

EDWARD D. SNYDER.

Haverford College.

DOPPELDRUCKE VON WIELANDS AUERLESENEN GEDICHTEN

Dass von der ersten Ausgabe der *Auserlesenen Gedichte*, Leipzig, 1784 (B⁵) mehr als ein Druck existierte, war bisher nicht geahnt worden. Bei Vergleichung mehrerer Exemplare erwies sich jedoch Bogen B eines Exemplares des ersten Bandes als Neudruck, und zwar schon durch die hier vorhandene Signatur: "Wielands auserl. Ged. I. Band." Die übrigen Bogen dieses Bandes tragen keine Signatur, sondern nur den Bogenweiser (A, C, D, usw.).¹ Lesarten: S. 17, 1 Durch seufzer EB^{5a} Mit seufzen B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 17, 6 welcher dich besessen EB^{5a} der dich plagte B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 17, 8 Das übel wuchs. Ich wollte dich nicht plagen, und änderte die cur EB^{5a} Ich änderte die cur B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 21, 1 die Schöne Welt B^{5a} die Schöne-Welt B^{5b}.

¹Um die Entdeckung weiterer Doppeldrucke zu erleichtern bemerke ich dass der 2. Bd. anfangs (Bogen A-M) "Wielands griech. Erzähl." signiert ist, später (Bogen N-X) "Wielands auserl. Ged.," ohne Bandzahl. Auch im 3. und 4. Bde. steht genau dieselbe Signatur, auch hier fehlt die Bandzahl. Nur in den Bänden 5-7 ist auch die betreffende Bandzahl angegeben. Daraus lässt sich folgern, dass der neugedruckte Bogen B des 1. Bandes nicht älter ist als Bd. 5 des Originaldrucks (1785).

21, 21 daß jenes B^{5a} Das jenes B^{5b} *Drf.* 23, 12 aus weissem thon EB^{5a} aus thon B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 24, 3 thür? B^{5a} thür, B^{5b}B⁶. 26, 8 *Phrynen* B^{5a} *Phrynen* B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 26, 18 läge; EB^{5a} läge, B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 26, 19 ihm träumt' EB^{5a} und träumt' B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 26, 22 erträncke EB^{5a} berausche B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 29, 2 einem Blick EB^{5a} einem—Blick B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 31, 5 Herr. Ich B^{5a} Herr; ich EB^{5b}C¹. 32, 1 wer weis EB^{5a} wer weiß B^{5b}C¹. An etwa 60 Stellen ersetzt B^{5b} die in B^{5a} vorkommende Majuskel durch die üblichere Minuskel; an 5 Stellen wird die Schreibweise *denck-* des Druckes B^{5a} in B^{5b} durch *denk-* ersetzt (20, 20; 21, 13; 22, 6; 24, 17; 29, 8).

Schon die Lesarten auf S. 17 beweisen dass B^{5b} keinen mechanischen Nachdruck von B^{5a}, sondern einen revidierten Text darstellt: dieser stimmt zwar in der Hauptsache mit B⁶ überein, stellt jedoch andererseits ein früheres Stadium der Revision dar. Man beachte z. B.: S. 17, 22 denckt B^{5ab} denkt B⁶. 18, 12 zancken B^{5ab} zanken B⁶. 21, 6 sehnt B^{5ab} sehnt, B⁶. 22, 12 denckt B^{5ab} denkt B⁶. 24, 14 sie; B^{5ab} sie: B⁶. 26, 7 trancken B^{5ab} tranken B⁶. 29, 17 flamm' B^{5ab} flamm B⁶.

AUSERLESENE GEDICHTE, Leipzig, 1789-1792.

Nur von den Bänden 1-6 dieser zweiten Ausgabe der *Auserlesenen Gedichte* (B⁶) liegen mir Doppeldrucke vor, der 7. Bd. ist in allen Exemplaren von ein- und demselben Satze. Der Nachschuss wurde also vor 1794, dem Erscheinungsjahr des 7. Bandes, gemacht,—von dem einmaligen Satze desselben konnte dann die nötig gewordene höhere Auflage sofort abgezogen werden. Der echte Druck B^{6a} kennzeichnet sich als solchen durch genauere Übereinstimmung mit der Vorlage B⁵: bei dem ersten Bande wurde der Doppeldruck B^{5b} benutzt, wie schon die oben mitgeteilten Lesarten dartun. Die Ausgabe letzter Hand scheint von B^{6a} abzustammen, obschon auch gelegentliche Übereinstimmungen zwischen B^{6b} und C¹ nachzuweisen sind.

ERSTER BAND: S. 1, 9 stellung B⁵B^{6a} Stellung B^{6b}. 4, 2 seiuem B^{6a} *Drf.* 9, 20 jagte, B^{6a} *Drf.* jagte. B⁵B^{6b}. 11, 13 spalt B⁵B^{6a} spalt; B^{6b}. 15, 8 belehrt; B⁵B^{6a} belehrt: B^{6b}. 21, 21 Das B^{5b}B^{6a} *Drf.* Daß B^{6b}; von faulem B⁵B^{6a} vom faulem B^{6b} *Drf.* 25, 15 gut, B⁵B^{6a} gut. B^{6b}. 27, 13 hatt' B^{6a} hätt' B^{6b}. 37, 21 schämen. B^{6a} schämen, B^{6b} *Drf.* 38, 13 gerungen B⁵B^{6a} gesungen B^{6b}. 48, 1

musikalischen B^{6a} musikalischen B⁵B^{6b}C¹. 51, 10 überirrd'sch B^{6a} Drf. überirrd'schen B⁵B^{6b}C¹. 60, 13 mir hundert B⁵B^{6a} mit hundert B^{6b} Drf. 61, 4 weisheit B^{6a} Weisheit B⁵B^{6b}. 62, 20 rosenfarbem B⁵B^{6a} rosenfarbnem B^{6b}C¹. 73, 17 nichts hat B^{6a} Drf. nichts bat B⁵B^{6b}C¹. Anstatt 151 hat B^{6a} die Seitenzahl 15.

ZWEYTER BAND: Titel, Zeile 8 in VIII. Büchern B⁵B^{6a} in VIII Büchern B^{6b}. Z. 9 nochmahls B^{6a} nochmals B^{6b}. Z. 10 WEIDMANNISCHEN B^{6a} Weidmannischen B^{6b}. S. 2, 6 scherzt B⁵B^{6a} scherzt' B^{6b}. 3, 11 fchon B^{6a} Drf. 4, 2 blicken B^{6a} bliken B⁵B^{6b}. 5, 16 scherz B⁵B^{6a} Scherz B^{6b}. 7, 5 schlafe B^{6b} Drf. 8, 18 kinder B⁵B^{6a} Kinder B^{6b}. 9, 15 Gotr B^{6a} Drf. 11, 4 meinem B^{6a} Drf. meinen B⁵B^{6b}. 11, 6 kan! B⁵ kann! B^{6a} kann B^{6b}. 11, 12 rücke B^{6a} Drf. rücken B⁶. 13, 16 schlummert B^{6b} Drf. 14, 12 einzuschließen; B⁵B^{6a} einzuschließen! B^{6b}. 16, 1 vorüberziehn B^{6a} vorüber ziehn B^{6b}. 16, 10 silberwagen B⁵B^{6a} Silberwagen B^{6b}. 16, 22 zurück B⁵B^{6a} zurück B^{6b}. 19, 14 dran B⁵B^{6a} dann B^{6b}. 22, 1 loszusagen B^{6a} los zu sagen B^{6b}. 22, 22 zn brauchen B^{6b} Drf. 24, 20 küssen: B⁵B^{6a} küssen. B^{6b}. 27, 4 er ruht' B^{6a} Drf. es ruht' B⁵B^{6b}. 28, 2 aller erstenmal B⁵ aller erstenmahl B^{6a} allererstenmal B^{6b}. 33, 14 liedgen vor: B⁵B^{6a} liedchen vor; B^{6b}. 38, 17 Ans B^{6a} Drf. Aus B^{6b}. 39, 18 geht B^{6a} Drf. gehn B^{6b}. 40, 8 verschlossen. B^{6a} Drf. verschlossen, B^{6b}. 40, 18 vollkommner B⁵ vollkommner B^{6a} vollkommner B^{6b}. 42, 13 anzuklagen, B^{6a} anzuklagen. B^{6b}. Anstatt 203 hat B^{6a} die Seitenzahl 320; anstatt 8, 39 hat B^{6b} 3, 59. Die zum 2. Bde von B^{6b} benutzte Schrift ist etwas grösser als die der übrigen Bände.

DRITTER BAND: Titel, Z. 11 Weidmannschen B^{6a} Weidmannischen B^{6b}. Bl. [ii]^a, 13 composizion B^{6a} composition B^{6b}. 7, 8 räuschen B^{6a} Drf. täuschen B^{6b}. 9, 5 den heiden B^{6a} den beiden B^{6b}. 12, 3 gestalten B^{6a} Drf. 17, 6 wirt herzhählen B^{6a} wirth erzählen B^{6b}. 41, 19 bedekt B⁵B^{6a} bedeckt B^{6b}. 45, 9 das B⁵B^{6a} daß B^{6b}. 51, 17 zufinden B⁵B^{6a} zu finden B^{6b}. 55, 2 wallten B⁵B^{6a} walten B^{6b} Drf. 62, 11 Ritter; B⁵B^{6a} Ritter: B^{6b}. 66, 4 nnr B^{6a} Drf. 69, 1 ungefehr B^{6a} ungefähr B^{6b}. 69, 10 fest B^{6a} fast B^{6b} Drf. 74, 16 los zugehn. B⁵B^{6a} loszugehn, B^{6b}. 74, 20 regunglos B⁵B^{6a} regungslos B^{6b}. 77, 9 wurd' er B⁵ ward' er B^{6a} ward er B^{6b}. 80, 14 zulieb B^{6a} Drf. zu lieb B^{6b}. 86, 8 blik B⁵B^{6a} blick B^{6b}. 88, 2 in hof B⁵B^{6a} im hof B^{6b}. 92, 17 blat B⁵B^{6a} blatt

B^{6b}. 112, 2 Men B^{6a} *Drf.* Man B^{6b}. 112, 18 strauß B⁵B^{6a} straus B^{6b}. 272 Jena, gedruckt bey Johann Michael Maucke B^{6a} *fehlt* B^{6b}.

VIERTER BAND: Titel, Z. 12 *Weidmannschen* B^{6a} *Weidmannschen* B^{6b}. S. 3, 11 sanftgekrümmter B^{6a} sanft gekrümmter B^{6b}. 6, 9 Varer B^{6a} *Drf.* Vater B^{6b}. 10, 1 friede B⁵B^{6a}C¹ frieden B^{6b}. 13, 2 fastzerstörtem B⁵B^{6a} fast zerstörtem B^{6b}. 13, 6 einzige B⁵B^{6a} einz'ge B^{6b}. 14, 1 gepflanszt B^{6b} *Drf.* 16, 14 wie in B⁵B^{6a} wie ein B^{6b}. 17, 10 erlabt B⁵B^{6a} er labt B^{6b}. 19, 5 dafür B^{6a} darauf B^{6b} *Drf.* 22, 8 sie B^{6a} sich B^{6b} *Drf.* 25, 14 sêle B⁵B^{6a} seele B^{6b}. 26, 14 ungefähr B^{6a} ohngefähr B^{6b}. 27, 7 fühlten B^{6a} fühlen B^{6b}. 31, 11 mindern B⁵B^{6a}C¹ lindern B^{6b}. 31, 18 flattert B^{6a} flattern B^{6b}. 32, 1 im sturmwind B^{6a}C¹ in sturmwind B^{6b}. 32, 4 Zulezt . . . ihr B^{6a} Zulezt . . . hier B^{6b}. 36, 1 hütten B^{6a}C¹ hütte B^{6b}. 36, 17 schlichen B^{6a} schliechen B^{6b}. 39, 2 blieb B^{6a} bleibt B^{6b}. 39, 5 rosigten B^{6a}C¹ rosigen B^{6b}. 40, 7 dem ihren B^{6a} den ihren B^{6b}. 190, 4 dem schilde B^{6a} den schilden B^{6b}. 191, 14 kniee B^{6a} 183, 2 im umlauf B^{6a} in umlauf B^{6b}. 188, 1 knaben B^{6a} knappen B^{6b}. 190, 4 dem schilde B^{6a} den schilden B^{6b}. 191, 14 kniee B^{6a} knie B^{6b}. 194, 6 gethan,, B^{6a} (*zwei Kommata*). 194, 11 seiner B^{6a} dieser B^{6b}. 197, 7 arbeitvollen B^{6a} arbeitsvollen B^{6b}. 197, 21 einer lanze B^{6a} eine lanze B^{6b}. 198, 9 Iungfraun B^{6a} Iungfrau B^{6b}. 198, 19 aus B^{6a} auf B^{6b} *Drf.* Anstatt 87 hat B^{6b} die Seitenzahl 86.

FÜNFTER BAND: Titel, Z. 8 *Weidmannschen* B^{6a} *Weidmannschen* B^{6b}. 3, 2 Kaligel B^{6a} Kaligei B^{6b} *Drf.* 3, 7 welt B^{6a} weit B^{6b} *Drf.* 10, 7 nnd B^{6a} *Drf.* 12, 12 Einen B^{6a} einen B^{6b}. 12, 13 gieng es B^{6a} gieng er B^{6b} *Drf.* 14, 3 zwyten B^{6a} *Drf.* zweyten B^{6b}. 17, 5 dünnen B^{6a} *Drf.* dünnem B^{6b}. 18, 15 electrischer B^{6a} elektrischer B^{6b}. 21, 11 Majestütsverbrechen B^{6b} *Drf.* 22, 3 wirst! die B^{6a} *Drf.* wirst die B^{6b}. 24, 13 bewohnbar B^{6a}C¹ bewohnt B^{6b} *Drf.* 27, 14 hekämet B^{6a} *Drf.* 29, 1 mirs rauben will B^{6a} mir rauben wlll B^{6b} *Drf.* 29, 20 diesem worten B^{6b} *Drf.* 30, 9 Dem besten B^{6a}C¹ Dem ersten B^{6b}. 33, 16 äusserllch B^{6a} *Drf.* 35, 3 sonderlichs B^{6a} sonderlich B^{6b}. 35, 9; 36, 1 blatt B^{6a} blat B^{6b}. 46, 3 durchgewacht B^{6a}C¹ durchgemacht B^{6b}. 54, 1 zappeln? B^{6a} zappeln! B^{6b}. 55, 14 mag! B^{6a} mag; B^{6b}. 60, 6 rauffen? B^{6a} rauffen! B^{6b}. 79, 13 schawrzem B^{6a} *Drf.* 79, 17 leidet B^{6a} leitet B^{6b} *Drf.* 102, 6 Einem B^{6a} einem B^{6b}. 104, 19

büſte B^{6a} büſte B^{6b}. 105, 6 Uzim-Öſchantey B^{6a} Uzim-Gſchantey B^{6b} *Drf.* 109, 14 eſelkopf B^{6a} eſelskopf B^{6b}C¹.

SECHSTER BAND: Titel, Z. 8 *Weidmannschen* B^{6a} *Weidmannischen* B^{6b}. An den Leser S. [iii-vi]: *kursiv* B^{6a} *in Antiqua* B^{6b}. [vi], 3 geſchäftigten B^{6a} *Drf.* geſchäftigen B^{6b}C¹. [vi], 15 fodern B^{6a} fordern B^{6b}. 3, 12 Aenéen B^{6b} Aenen B^{6a} Aeneen B^{6b}. 5, 2 Zefeyrn B^{6a} *Drf.* Zefyrn B^{6b}. 5, 10 in mährchen B^{6b}C¹ in mährchen B^{6b}. 10, 1 ans B^{6a} *Drf.* aus B^{6b}; Titons B^{6a} Titans B^{6b} *Drf.* 10, 17 ſammetweichem B^{6a} ſammetweichen B^{6b}. 11, 19 alta B^{6a} *Drf.* alte B^{6b}. 14, 18 ihrem B^{6a} ihren B^{6b} *Drf.* 18, 13 folge B^{6b}C¹ folgte B^{6b}. 19, 12 hofnung B^{6b}C¹ hoffnung B^{6b}. 25, 12 beiſſt B^{6a} *Drf.* heiſſt B^{6b}. 31, 2 durchzutrotten B^{6a} durchzurotten B^{6b} *Drf.* 35, 5 ſtille B^{6a} ſtillen B^{6b}C¹. 39, 2 mir ſogar der B^{6b}C¹ mir der B^{6b}. 40, 4 mach B^{6a} *Drf.* macht. B^{6b}. 40, 13 die namenloſe B^{6b}C¹ die namenloſen B^{6b}C¹. 46, 15 nich B^{6a} *Drf.* 47, 1 daſe B^{6a} *Drf.* daſſ B^{6b}. 53, 5 koſtatt B^{6a} *Drf.* hoſtatt B^{6b}. 54, 14 haubthâr B^{6b} haubthaar B^{6a} haupthaar B^{6b}. 55, 6 ſtâl B^{6a} ſtahl B^{6b}C¹. 63, 16 gedrcückt B^{6a} *Drf.* 69, 15 jeder tropfe B^{6b}C¹ jeder tropfen B^{6b}C¹. 77, 15 ſolltet B^{6a} ſollet B^{6b} *Drf.* 254, 18 Zbniden B^{6a} *Drf.* 259, 7 ſckmilzt B^{6a} *Drf.* 262, 1 einem B^{6a} einen B^{6b} *Drf.* 267, 10 der jugend B^{6a}C¹ der tugend B^{6b}. 280, 1 welche B^{6a} welchen B^{6b} *Drf.* Anſtatt 130 hat B^{6a} die Seitenzahl 103.

W. KURRELMEYER.

THE SPANISH SOURCES OF CERTAIN SIXTEENTH CENTURY FRENCH WRITERS

In a little book published in 1912, by Monsieur Pierre Villey, *Les Sources d'idées au seizième siècle*, the distinguished French scholar was the first to emphasize the fact that if the influence of Spain upon French literature became important in the seventeenth century, it had already begun to be felt in the sixteenth through the activity of French translators. Mr. Villey, however, limited himself to general statements and did not attempt to estimate the number of French translations which issued from French presses during that period; nor did he try to define their influence upon French thought, except, perhaps, in the case of Montaigne.

A study of Foulché-Delbosc's *Bibliographie Hispano-Française* and Brunet's *Manuel du Libraire* indicated that at least 625 editions of French translations from Spanish works appeared in France during the sixteenth century. Of these, 352 were romances of chivalry or sentimental novels; 94 dealt with theological questions; 169 may be called, for the sake of convenience, books on moral philosophy; and 30 were accounts of voyages or descriptions of newly-found lands. It is with these last two divisions of French editions, nearly two hundred in number, that we are concerned here.

A preliminary survey showed that the influence of this significantly large number of translations was exercised, primarily, upon a group of French writers commonly known as *essayistes*, in contrast to the *conteurs*, or story tellers. No definite distinction, however, can be made between these two classes of writers. We find considerable philosophical or encyclopaedic material in the text of the *conteurs*, and many a story in that of the *essayistes*. We may say, in general, that the productions of the latter consisted of heterogeneous compilations of maxims, anecdotes, fables, legends, historical reminiscences, geographical descriptions, scientific curiosities, and didactic or satirical digressions, sometimes contained within the frame-work of a dialogue, sometimes worked into the form of lessons, or short chapters, but very often presented to the reader in fanciful or disordered array after the medieval fashion of Giraldus Cambrensis or Caesar of Heisterbach.

This literary *genre*, which seems to have been a development of such works as the *Moralia* of Plutarch, the *Attic Nights* of Aulus Gellius, and the *De Factis Dictisque Memorabilibus Libri IX* of Valerius Maximus, found expression, in the sixteenth century, in the *Adagia* of Erasmus, the *Lectio-num antiquarum Libri XVI* of Coelius Rhodiginus, in the *Officina* of Ravisius Textor, and in the *De honesta disciplina* of Crinitus.

In France, the most representative essayists of the period were:

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| Pierre Bouaystuan, | <i>Théâtre du Monde</i> , 1558. <i>Histoires prodigieuses</i> , 1560. |
| Jean de Marcouville, | <i>Recueil d'aucuns cas merveilleux</i> , 1563. |
| Jacques Tahureau, | <i>Dialogues</i> , 1565. |
| Pierre Breslay, | <i>Anthologie</i> , 1574. |
| Jean des Caures, | <i>Oeuvres morales et diversifiées</i> , 1575. |
| Montaigne, | <i>Les Essais</i> , 1580, 1588. |

Nicolas de Cholières, *Les Matinées*, 1585. *Les Après Disnées*, 1587.
Guillaume Bouchet, *Les Serées*, 1584, 1597, 1598.

All these writers are more or less indebted to Spanish sources. In the case of Montaigne there is little that can be added to the researches of Messrs. Pierre Villey, Louis Clément, and Gilbert Chinard. These critics have shown, for instance, that the great French essayist borrowed the idea of grouping his material under central headings from Pedro Mexía, the author of the *Silva de Varia Lección*; that the bulk of his essays on *Les Cannibales* and on *Les Coches* was taken from Gomara's *Historia de las Indias*; and that at the head of a group of Spanish moralists, read by him, stood bishop Antonio Guevara, the author of *Marcus Aurelius*, and the *Golden Epistles*.

Between the *Essays* of Montaigne and the diversified productions of the other French essayists there is evidently a vast difference. It is useless to expect from the latter the exquisite style and the penetrating power of observation of one who has been called the father of analytical psychology. They must be given credit, however, for having contributed to the popularization of knowledge at a time when the thirst for new things was apparently unquenchable. They helped to enlarge society's point of view, which was imbued with the spirit of the Renaissance, by reproducing and repeating one after another, facts and ideas from Plutarch, Herodotus, Pliny, and Aristotle, as well as from contemporary scientists, explorers, and historians. Some had the merit of preceding and perhaps paving the way for Montaigne, others emulated him; they are therefore entitled to a share of his glory.

Our investigations have shown that the joint influence of Guevara and Mexía is especially strong in Pierre Bouaystuan's *Théâtre du Monde*. In this pessimistic little book, which is a long-drawn lamentation on the wretchedness and insignificance of man, there is little original material. What Bouaystuan does not reproduce from the Scriptures or St. Augustine's *City of God*, from Pliny or from the Italian scientist Cardanus, he takes from Guevara's works and from Mexía's *Diverses Leçons*. In so doing he shows little regard for literary ethics and frequently appears to be quoting ancient authors while, as a matter of fact, he reproduces textually the two Spanish writers. Two instances of this will suffice:

Bouaystuan.¹

Marc Varron, l'un des plus dignes auteurs qu'onques escrivit en Latin, dit qu'en Espagne il y eut un gros bourg situé en pais sablonneux, qui fut tellement fouy & cavé par les connils finalement les habitants l'abandonnerent.

Mexia.²

Marc Varron dit qu'en Espagne y eut un gros bourg, situé en pays sablonneux, qui fut tellement foui et cavé par les connils que finalement il fut ruiné.

Bouaystuan.

L'Empereur Auguste disoit que depuis que les hommes avoient vecu cinquante ans ils devoient mourir ou desirer qu'on les tuat pource que jusque là étoit le comble de la félicité humaine.

Guevara.³

L'Empereur Auguste Octavien disoit que depuis que les hommes vivoient cinquante ans, ou de leur volontier devoient mourir ou par force se devoient faire tuer pource que tous ceux qui ont eu quelque félicité humaine jusque là sont au terme, comble et fin d'icelle.

In a few instance the *Théâtre du Monde* contains marginal references to its sources, but these may have been inserted by the printer after the composition of the work. In most cases there are no indications of the author reproduced or imitated. An exception to this statement must be noted, however, in Bouaystuan's treatment of life at court. This is a nearly textual, two page reproduction from Antonio Guevara's *Menosprecio de Corte*, with due reference to its source.⁴ The total indebtedness of Bouaystuan

¹ From: *Le Théâtre du Monde. Contenant le discours des misères humaines. Plus, L'Excellence & dignité de l'homme. Composé par P. Bouaystuan. A Lyon, par Nicolas Perrineau. M. D. LXV.*

² From: *Les Diverses leçons de Pierre Messie. Gentil-homme de Seville. Mises de Castillan en François, par Claude Gruget, Parisien. A Rouen, de l'Imprimerie de Jean Roger. M. D. XXVI.*

³ From: *L'Horloge des Princes, avec le trèsrenommé Livre de Marc Aurèle, Receuilly par don Antoine de Guevara. Traduit de Castillan par feu Herberay des Essars. A Paris. Chez Michel Sonnius. 1588. (First edition issued in 1555.)*

⁴ The first French edition of this work appeared in 1542 from the press of Estienne Dolet, at Lyon. It enjoyed 19 editions before the end of the century. It is fundamentally a picture of the trials and disappointments of court life as contrasted with the advantages of rural life. It appeared when Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano* was at the height of its popularity and the two books were generally considered as representing the two opposite sides of a much debated question.

to Spanish authors, as far as the *Théâtre du Monde* is concerned, amounts to at least twenty-five passages, varying in length from short paragraphs to several pages.

Among the French essayists of the sixteenth century who are still relegated to the category of obscure writers, there is a certain Seigneur de Cholières, who produced, in the second half of the century, a series of four books,⁶ made up of rambling dissertations and dialogues on the most varied subjects, in a style colored at times with the good-humored facetiousness of Rabelais, at others with the cynical licentiousness of Béroalde de Verville. The few commentators who have done Cholières the honor of criticizing his works have not been altogether favorable to him, and yet they have recognized that he was a man of erudition and that he wrote good vernacular French. The value of Cholières' works may possibly lie in his views on the feminine question. His chapters: *On women, On marriage, On the age of husbands*, reveals some originality and considerable familiarity with the philosophy of married life.

Cholières is indebted to Spanish sources for the greater part of his *Matinées*' first chapter, *De l'or et du fer*, into which he launches into a violent invective against the Spanish *conquistadores*, their thirst for gold and their cruelties against the natives. In so doing he follows closely Lopez de Gomara's *Historia de las Indias*,⁶ in the first part of which an account is given of the explorations of Bastides and of Juan de la Cosa, of the Caribs and their attacks upon the Spaniards, and of the inevitable reprisals.

Cholières would seem to indicate that he was familiar with Bartolomé de las Casas' *Brevissima Relación*⁷ as he comments upon the sufferings caused to both Indians and Spaniards by the latter's mad search for gold. In the same chapter he reproduces from

⁶ *Les Neuf Matinées*, 1585; *Les Après-Disnées*, 1587; *La Guerre des masles contre les femelles*, 1588; and *La Forêt nuptiale*, 1600.

⁶ The first French edition is as follows: *Histoire des Indes occidentales et terres neuves, qui, jusqu'à présent ont été découvertes. Traduit en français par Martin Fumée*. Paris, 1569.

⁷ This work, which was translated in the chief languages of Europe and which precipitated a violent controversy on the question of slavery, was published at Sevilla, in 1552. It was translated into French by Jacques Migrodes and first appeared in its French garb in 1579.

Mexía's *Diverses Leçons* a long array of facts related to rings and their uses in different regions. In his *Après-Disnées* Cholières dedicates a chapter to beards, and in the discussion of this odd subject he adorns his text with a rather fanciful elaboration of facts mentioned by Gomara in his descriptions of early Mexican races. In another chapter, *Des Prognostics et Prédictions Astrologiques*, he refers to the expedient resorted to by Columbus on the Island of Jamaica, when, driven by hunger, he threatened to darken the surface of the moon unless the natives provided him with food. This constitutes another close reproduction from a chapter of Gomara's *Historia*, which contains an account of Columbus' fourth voyage. In both his books Cholières inserts, here and there, episodes and data borrowed from Mexía and Guevara.

Jean Bouchet, the son of a well known printer of Poitiers, was judge and consul for the merchants of his native town. Like Nicolas de Troye and Noël du Faÿl he enthusiastically dedicated to writing the spare hours left from his official duties. He became associated with a little group of men who constituted a sort of small provincial Pléiade. His name was closely linked with those of Scévole de Sainte-Marthe, Jean de la Péruse, and de Baif. Bouchet, without attaining any high degree of literary excellence, had an intimate knowledge of his contemporaries, and although not especially gifted with imagination, he possessed a vast and remarkable erudition. His *Serées* consist of three books, made up of conversations and dialogues, on the usual diversified subjects, held at the table, each evening, by certain townspeople of Poitiers. There are 36 of these *soirées* and each, after the model set by Mexía, deals with some special subject such as wine, water, women and girls, physicians and medicine, thieves, cripples or hunchbacks, and cases of individuals that had been beheaded, hanged, or banished.

As a result of these investigations we were able to identify reproductions from Spanish authors in at least twenty of Bouchet's *Serées*, in addition to many scattered references to Spanish works. Aside from the abundant material he appropriates from Guevara, Mexía, and Gomara, Bouchet takes from López de Castañeda, who had written, in 1554, a history of the conquest of India by the Portuguese; from Antonio de Torquemada, the author of that fantastic *Jardín de Flores Curiosas*, known in France as the *Her-*

améron; from Oviedo's *Historia General de las Indias*; and from Juan Vives' *Commentaries on St. Augustine's City of God*. In his chapter on *Wealth* and *Avarice* Bouchet indicates that he has read bishop de las Casas' description of Spanish greed. He also had read that landmark of Spanish literature, the *Celestina*, and Mr. Gustave Reynier has shown how Bouchet inserted in his fifth *Serée* a long and textual reproduction from the ninth act of this Spanish tragedy.⁸

A more interesting contribution to the *Serées*, however, was that of Juan de Dios Huarte, an eminent physician who had published, in 1575, a psychological study so remarkable for its daring speculations that it was placed upon the Index, but not before it had been translated into Italian, French and Spanish, and reedited many times in these languages. In French it was known as the *Anacrise*, or *Examen des Esprits*, and its author was not generally known.⁹

Although Bouchet does not always mention his sources the name of the *Anacrise* appears at least thirty times throughout his work. Reproductions from Huarte are especially numerous and lengthy in the 34th *Serée*, entitled: *Les Fols, Plaisans, Idiots & Badins*. Bouchet seems to have been impressed by Huarte's analysis of judgment, of intellect and memory, by his ideas on the methods of acquiring a new language, and by his speculations on the causes of insanity.

G. L. MICHAUD.

University of Michigan.

SOURCES OF TWO SONNETS OF BARTOLOMÉ LEONARDO DE ARGENSOLA

The fact that Bartolomé Leonardo borrowed from the *Canzoniere* of Petrarch is especially interesting in that it shows the inaccuracy of certain general statements that have long been accepted. In his *Historia de las ideas estéticas en España*,¹ Menéndez y Pelayo

⁸ *Les Origines du Roman Réaliste*, 1912, p. 309.

⁹ *Anacrise, ou Parfait jugement et examen des Esprits propres & nais aux sciences. Composé en Espagnol par M. Jean Huart. Docteur, mis en françois, au grand profit de la République, par Gabriel Chappuys Tourageau. A Lyon, par Francois Didier, à l'enseigne du Fénix 1580.*

¹ Vol. II, second ed., Madrid, 1896, p. 388.

said of the younger of the Argensolas: "Su arte predilecto es el arte latino: no el italiano. Aborrece de muerte la sutileza y el metafisiqueo de los petrarquistas . . . Enójale todo uso frívolo y baladí de la poesía: no la concibe más que como matrona celtíbera, armada de hierro y con la ley moral en los labios"; and very nearly the same words were applied by the Count de la Viñaza to both brothers.² These statements will certainly require modification when a complete study of the sources of the two poets has been made.

Petrarch, indulging his fondness for subtleties, wrote his sonnet XIX:

Mille fiate, o dolce mia guerrera,
Per aver co' begli occhi vostri pace,
V'aggio proferto il cor; m'a voi non piace
Mirar sí basso colla mente altera:
E se di lui fors' altra donna spera,
Vive in speranza debile e fallace;
Mio, perché sdegno ciò ch'a voi dispiace,
Esser non può già mai così com'era.
Or s'io lo scaccio, ed e' non trova in voi,
Ne l'esilio infelice, alcun soccorso,
Né sa star sol, né gire ov'altri il chiama,
Poria smarrire il suo natural corso:
Che grave colpa fia d'ambeduo noi,
E tanto più de voi, quanto più v'ama.³

Argensola's imitation is limited to the quatrains:

No es mío mi corazón, pues os le he dado,
Ni vuestro, pues que no lo habéis querido;
A mí no ha de volver, que aborrecido
Le tengo, pues de vos es desamado.
Pues dalle a otra mujer, tan excusado
Será, como de vos ser recibido;
Ni en mí ni en vos, ni en otro recogido
A donde alberga el corazón cuitado.
Amor que ni por fuerza ni por ruego
Puede alcanzar del vuestro que le quiera,
Que desprecia de altivo sus despojos,
Porque siervo tan fiel no se le muera,

² *Algunas obras satíricas de Lupercio y Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola*, Saragossa, 1887, p. 8.

³ *Le Rime di Francesco Petrarca*, ed. G. Mestica, Firenze Barbèra, 1896, p. 23.

Le cría y le sustenta con el fuego
Que hurta de la lumbre de esos ojos.⁴

Equally subtle is Petrarch's sonnet CIX:

Amor, che nel penser mio vive e regna,
E'l suo seggio maggior nel mio cor tène,
Talor armato ne la fronte vène:
Ivi si loca, ed ivi pon sua insegna.
Quella ch'amare e sofferir ne 'nsegna,
E vòl che 'l gran desio, l'accesa spene
Ragion, vergogna e reverenza affrene,
Di nostro adir fra sé stessa si sdegna.
Onde Amor paventoso fugge al core,
Lasciando ogni sua impresa, e piange e trema:
Ivi s'asconde, e non appar piú fòre.
Che poss' io far, temendo il mio signore,
Se non star seco infin a l'ora estrema?
Ché bel fin fa chi ben amando more.⁵

Here the adaptation is more close, the poet departing from his model only in the last tercet:

Amor, que en mi profundo pensamiento
Sus nobles fuerzas aprestadas tiene,
Tal vez armado hasta los ojos viene,
De donde a los de Cintia lo presento.
Mas ella opuesta al raro atrevimiento,
Para que en lo futuro se refrene,
Aquella risa, aquel favor detiene,
Con que suele aliviar el sufrimiento.
Huye a su centro el dulce dueño mío
Temeroso y cortés; que no hay sugeto
Que contra sus desdenes muestre brío:
Yo deste rayo, no por el efeto
Que en los mortales haze, me desvío;
Mas porque sirve a celestial preceto.⁶

OTIS H. GREEN.

University of Pennsylvania.

⁴ *Obras sueltas de Lupercio y Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola, coleccionadas e ilustradas por el Conde de la Viñaza, Madrid, 1889, vol. II, p. 43.*

⁵ *Le Rime*, ed. cit., p. 213.

⁶ *Rimas de Lupercio i del Dotor Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola, Saragossa, 1634, p. 193.*

OLD NORSE NOTES

7. *Some Observations on Mímir.*

In Norse mythology Mímir (or Mímr) is an enigmatic figure. The material bearing upon him is mostly contained in the Eddic poem "Völuspá" and even this little is cryptic and seemingly inconsistent. In stanzas 28 and 29¹ we are informed of a fountain of Mímir in which Odin's eye is concealed, and that Mímir drinks every morning from the pledge of Odin. In stanza 46, at the approach of *ragnarök*, there is mention of the playing of the sons of Mímr and of Odin speaking to (consulting?) the head of Mímr. The speaking of the head of Mímr is mentioned in a fragment included in the Eddic poem "Sigdrífumál (stanza 14), where it is evidently also associated with Odin. If stanza 13 of this poem belongs with 14, as one must assume to be the case, and if its *Heiðdraupnir* is identical with Mímr, as it has been understood,² this stanza refers Odin's (*Hróptr*) knowledge of the runes to inspiration from the liquid dripping from the skull of Mímr. The kenning *Míms vinr* (friend of Mímr) for Odin occurs three times in skaldic poetry.³ Comment of the *Snorra Edda* upon the references in "Völuspá" is not without interest. The "Gylfaginning"⁴ locates the fountain of Mímir beneath one of the three roots of Yggdrasils ash, that one toward the *hrímpursar* (frost giants), and explains that it contains wisdom, which its owner Mímir secures by drinking from it with the Gjallarhorn. Odin had to pawn his eye for a drink from this fountain. Again in the account of the approach of *ragnarök*⁵ it is told that Odin rides to the fountain of Mímir and takes counsel of Mímir for himself and the other gods. These notes rightly or wrongly serve to clarify one's ideas as to the content particularly of *Völ.* 29. At first glance there may seem to be a more substantial addition in the

¹ Sijmon's edition.

² Cf. Gering's translation: *Die Edda*, 214 (1892); also the translation of Heusler-Genzmer: *Edda*, II, 168 f. (1920).

³ Cf. Jónsson, 2nd edition of Egilsson, *Lexicon poeticum*, under Mímir; Meissner, *Die Kenningar der Skalden*, 252.

⁴ *Snorra Edda*, ed. Jónsson, 20 f.

⁵ P. 63.

rather remarkable account of Mimir contained in the introductory part of the "Ynglinga saga" at the beginning of Snorri's *Heimskringla*.⁶ On the occasion of the establishing of peace after war between the two groups (of gods), Æsir and Vanir, hostages were exchanged, the Æsir sending Hœnir, with Mimir accompanying him. As it became evident to the Vanir that Hœnir depended entirely upon Mimir for advice, they felt themselves duped, cut off the head of Mimir and sent it to the Æsir. Odin embalmed the head with herbs to prevent its decay, and uttered incantations over it so that it retained the power of speech and could furnish him otherwise unattainable information and advice. The whole account of the gods at the beginning of the "Ynglinga saga" is notoriously euhemeristic and one may readily suspect that the embalming of the head is a rational explanation of how Odin could have possessed a head (not his own) from which he secured advice, rather than a part of any ancient myth.⁷ The account of the circumstances under which Mimir was deprived of his head may on the other hand well be old, at any rate the inclusion of Mimir among the gods, or more specifically among the Æsir, is decidedly important and entirely in accord with the little said about him in older sources. One can hardly escape the assumption that Mimir (or Mímr) was originally a god, not for example a giant or a water-spirit, unless we insist on referring the gods themselves back to phenomena of nature. Both later comment and older Eddic and skaldic sources are entirely consistent in indicating a close relationship between Odin and Mimir and apparently also in making Odin secure knowledge in general or particular advice from Mimir. The advice is however not secured directly from the living Mimir, but (and here lies an inconsistency in the commentary as apparently also the original) through two sources: the head of Mimir and his fountain or spring. One can hardly refrain from seeking some connection or an actual identity between the two so different conceptions. It must have been a feeling of the

⁶ Ed. Jónsson, I, 12 f., 18.

⁷ A. Bugge at the close of an otherwise interesting article (*Saga-Book of the Viking Society*, IX, 371, 1925) suggests Celtic influence, in that while the primitive Germans were not in the habit of saving heads the Gauls used to preserve the heads of their chieftains in oil, but this obviously has no application to the story of Mimir.

necessity of such connection that led Mogk⁸ to say that a spring is the "head" of a river. Now the "head of a stream" is a familiar enough expression in English and common elsewhere and Mogk's explanation is of course not a new one.⁹ I doubt if in the expression anything more than a physical comparison is involved. The source of a stream is naturally its highest point, its "head." That its other extremity is called its mouth instead of its foot is merely a different comparison in which the other no longer presents itself to the mind. One does not call a body of water as such a head, and still less a head a body of water. In fact Schröder¹⁰ expressly denies that the place-names in which "head" and its cognates occur designating the source of a stream have any validity in proof of the suggestion of Uhland.

A much more likely connection, it seems to me, is to be found in the old Germanic use of the human skull as a drinking-vessel, attested for example by Paulus Diaconus¹¹ and for Old Norse illustrated in the making of drinking-cups out of the skulls of the two sons of Atli¹² and the two sons of Níðuðr.¹³ Such a drinking-vessel fashioned from the skull of Mímir could readily have been designated in poetry both the head of Mímir and his fountain, from which Odin drank. That the wisdom of the living head should be retained in a beverage drunk from the skull is a not unnatural conception. So far as streams or small bodies of water may have taken their names from Mímir,¹⁴ the name-giving may with as much or as little probability be referred back to wide-

⁸ Hoops, *Reallexikon der germ. Altertumskunde*, III, 225 (1915). Mogk also subscribes to the idea that Mímir was a water-spirit and infers a contamination of a religious rite of consulting a dead man's head.

⁹ Cf. Ludwig Uhland, *Schriften*, VI, 206 (originally published 1836); Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, V, 102 (1883); Golther, *Religion und Mythos der Germanen*, 73 (1909); and more recently E. Schröder in *Namn och Bygd*, XII, 110 ff. (1924) and XIV, 20 ff. (1926).

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, XII, 118.

¹¹ *Historia Langobardorum*, I, 27; II, 28.

¹² "Atlamál" 77.

¹³ "Völundarkvitha" 25. The use of the human skull as a drinking-vessel is treated with great thoroughness by Andree in *Zeitschr. d. Ver. f. Volkskunde*, XXII, 1 ff., 1912.

¹⁴ Uhland, *op. cit.*, 202 f.

spread knowledge of the myth of the drinking from his skull as to his having been originally a water-spirit. It is indeed a question whether certain other Old Norse mythological matter may not have originated under the influence of this myth, particularly the somewhat farcically employed conception of Odin securing his poetic inspiration from a draught of the mead of Suttungr.¹⁵ Whether the conception of the fountain of Urðr (the fate representing the past) may have also developed out of that of the fountain of Mímir or the relation is a different one I shall not discuss here. The two have at least become intertwined to some extent.

What seems to me peculiar confirmation of the above interpretation of the head and fountain of Mímir is found in a late saga, the so-called *Þorsteins saga bæjarmagns*. This is one of the fairly short fornaldarsaga-like tales¹⁶ attached to the Norwegian king, Óláfr Tryggvason, and contains, as many of them do, interesting mythological or legendary material, in a late and much distorted form. Among the Odyssean adventures of the hero is an encounter with Goðmundr á Glæsisvöllum (Guðmundr á Glasisvöllum), a person of gigantic stature, son of the king of Risaland, to which country he is now heir after the death of his father. The kingdom is tributary to the giant Geirrauðr (Geirrøðr), king of Jötunheimar. Now Geirrøðr is well known from older Norse sources as an original giant, with whom Thor was on hostile terms. Guðmundr, judging from the frequent mention of him, must also have played a part in early myths or legends, though his original story is not preserved. I have elsewhere¹⁷ for reasons quite independent of the *Þorsteins saga bæjarmagns* conjectured that Odin himself must somewhere have appeared under this name. That he here meets us as a giant is the natural fate of a heathen god in a Christian time and environment, which has not gone so far as to make him a devil. Even here, in contrast to the original

¹⁵ "Hávamál" 103-109; "Hav." 140, which is probably not in its proper place and at any rate refers to this same episode, speaks of a son of Bölþorn (uncle of Odin?) who taught Odin nine incantations and so enabled him to get the mead. This uncle of Odin has been taken to be Mímir (Rydberg, *Undersökningar i germansk mytologi*, I, 468 f., 1886; Gering, *Die Edda*, 106, 1892; Heusler-Genzmer, *Edda*, II, 171, 1920).

¹⁶ Published in *Fornmanna Sögur*, III, 175 ff., 1827.

¹⁷ *Modern Philology*, xxv, 154, 1927.

giant, Geirrþór, he is kindly and well-disposed toward the hero, but naturally antagonistic toward Geirrþór, whose destruction he coöperates with the hero to bring about, and to whose kingdom he accordingly succeeds.¹⁸ Among the valued possessions of King Geirrþór was a remarkable large drinking-horn which bore the name of Grímr hinn góði. At its tip it was adorned with a human head with flesh and mouth (or according to another reading flesh and hair); it had the power of speech and could prophesy the future, especially the coming of war. Things of value had to be given it by all who drank from it. Over a hundred years ago this horn Grímr was explained¹⁹ as borrowed from the myth about the head of Mímir, and the corruption or change of name to Grímr was apparently correctly accounted for through the apelative *gríma* (=mask²⁰). While the horn is not represented in the *Þorsteins saga* as originally belonging to Guðmundr, it naturally becomes his property, like the other possessions of Geirrþór, after the latter's death. Its byname *hinn góði* is also of importance in judging its origin. In the *Hrólfs saga Gautrekssonar*²¹ there is a horn also characterized as *it góða*, named Hringhorni, with a ring upon the tip and with power of prophetic warning, though not the power of human speech. The "*Helga þátr Þórissonar*"²² also knows the name Grímr belonging to each of two horns sent by Guðmundr af Glæsisvöllum to King Óláfr Tryggvason, brought by two messengers who were likewise named Grímr. This is repeated in the first chapter of the "*Nornagests þátr*."²³ Even Saxo²⁴ knows of a remarkable horn among other valuable posses-

¹⁸ The Eddic poem "*Grímnismál*" presents a conflict between Odin under the *alias* of Grímnir, and Geirrþór. Though the prose framework and introductory stanzas seem to conceive of Geirrþór as a king and not a giant, it is a question whether he is not originally the same Geirrþór and this story of the encounter between Odin (Grímnir) and Geirrþór does not stand in some relation to the story of Guðmundr and Geirrþór.

¹⁹ By Peter Erasmus Müller in *Sagabibliothek*, III, 246 f., 1820.

²⁰ Grímr is also a name of Odin; Müller also saw the close connection of the story otherwise with the account of Guthmundus and Geruthus given by Saxo Grammaticus, ed. Holder, 287 ff.

²¹ Detter, *Zwei Fornaldarsögur*, 46 f., 65 f.

²² *Flat.*, I, 359 ff.; *Fms.*, III, 135 ff.

²³ Wilken, *Die prosaische Edda*, ed. 2, I, 237.

²⁴ Ed. Holder, 290 f.

sions of Geruthus (Geirrøðr), but as in the "Helga þátr" without any clear connection with Mímir. However both these sources seem to point to the same obscured identity of Guðmundr with Odin. The twelve splendid maidens of the "Helga þátr," who appear to the hero riding from the woods, clad in red and with horses to match, whose seductive leader Ingibjörg declares herself to be the daughter of Guðmundr af Glæsisvöllum, may well be Odin's valkyries, and it is a remarkable correspondence that Saxo also has twelve seductive daughters of Guthmundus (along with twelve sons).

That Mímir appears in the *Þiðreks saga* and other German sources as the name of a skilled smith is merely a natural lowering (or raising, if one prefer) of his chief characteristic of wisdom to manual skill. Kaarle Krohn²⁵ has reversed the relation, suggesting that the name Mímir was taken from the German heroic legend, where he appeared as a smith. Krohn's reference to a Christian legend concerning Adam's skull seems also to be entirely without value in this connection.²⁶ If the name has been correctly interpreted as related to the Latin *memor*, etc., the element of wisdom is already present in its etymology.

A. LEROY ANDREWS.

Cornell University.

STURM UND DRANG ONCE MORE

In preparing my little study on *Early References to Storm and Stress in German Literature*, published in the *Indiana University Studies* (No. 71) about a year ago, it did not occur to me that this modest contribution would attract much attention. Now it has been honored by two notices in this one journal, the note of Professor Kurrelmeyer in XLII, 3 (March), 1927, pp. 176-177, and the eight-page disquisition of Professor Walz in XLII, 8 (December), 1927, pp. 531-538. My chief purpose was to supplement the account in the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* with a view to assisting the German scholars in charge of the forthcoming *Heft* which

²⁵ *Skandinavisk mytologi*, 112, 1922.

²⁶ Vergil's and other speaking and prophesying heads are referred to in Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie* (4th ed., by E. H. Meyer), III, 109, 1878.

will contain the word "Sturm." In having elicited two such important *Vorarbeiten* as these two notices constitute, I feel that my effort, which merely presented and interpreted such material as I had happened to find with limited library resources at my disposal, has not been in vain.

By drawing attention to his own and other studies in the *Zeitschrift für Wortforschung*, Professor Walz has brought to light material of whose existence I was unaware. I note with satisfaction that it tends to corroborate some of my general findings. The points upon which the conclusions of Professor Walz seem to differ from mine I should like to touch briefly, again with a view to the forthcoming article in the *Deutsches Wörterbuch*.

My reference in the Preface to the "generally prevalent" (and erroneous) belief that *Sturm und Drang* as applied to the movement owes its inception to Tieck, was aimed not so much at the books, though of course it can be found in some, as it was at opinion which I have heard expressed in numerous academic lectures and conversations both here and abroad. I meant to correct it. The passage by Hildebrand in the *Wörterbuch* I can not help interpreting to mean that he actually felt that Goethe, Horn and Menzel were unfamiliar with the term as a *terminus technicus* because they did not use it. Hildebrand overlooks passages in Horn's book of 1812 (p. 182—also an allusion on p. 169)¹ and Menzel's of 1828, and quotes not a single occurrence before Tieck. His eighteenth-century citations merely serve to show the genesis of the term, and that incompletely. I still have the feeling that Hildebrand's article, with its serious gap, which could easily have been filled by Schlegel, Horn, Bouterwek, etc., creates in a sense the impression of inconsistency. The manner in which he states that he has found no occurrences before 1828, gives me the impression that he has searched in vain and doubts their existence, at least to any large extent. Then he proceeds, on Tieck's authority alone, to call the term "völlig gangbar" in 1828. It strikes me as inconsistent in Hildebrand to proceed part-way on his own

¹ See also Horn's *Umriss zur Geschichte und Kritik der schönen Literatur Deutschlands während der Jahre 1790 bis 1818*, Berlin, 1819, p. 35: "die Sturm- und Drang- und Empfindsamkeitsperiode," and "Man hatte eingesehen, dass es mit dem Stürmen und Drängen doch nicht viel auf sich . . . habe."

authority and then, that failing as the result of oversights, to rely solely upon Tieck for a statement not in harmony with his personal findings.

My statement that the term does not become "fixed and standard" before Scherer seems to have been misleading. It was based not upon any frequency tabulation. And indeed Scherer does not use the term more frequently than some of his predecessors, though I have the conviction that he is rather more conscious of its position of primacy as compared with the other terms, than Gervinus, Koberstein and Vilmar are. The idea I meant to convey was not that Scherer first gave the term currency, for I called attention to its use by his predecessors. My thought was that the present primacy of the expression in current usage, though beset by the welcome attempt of Köster and others to create a distinction between it and *Periode der Originalgenies*, is due in great part to Scherer and above all to the widespread influence of his book upon scholarship. By virtue of his tremendous influence, I would say, Scherer fixed and standardized the phrase for the generations succeeding him, just as he fixed and standardized for many years his whole method of approach.

Professor Walz cautions us that we must distinguish carefully between the literary *terminus technicus* and the looser use of the term as referring to emotional literature. I fear, however, that in dealing with early occurrences, as that which Professor Kurrelmeyer quotes from the *A B C Buch für grosse Kinder*, and those which I found in H. L. Wagner, Nicolai, Knigge and Iffland, it is not always safe to label them too precisely loose or technical. Evidently the term was then in the process of growing into its technical connotation. Rather than simply call such uses general and loose, I should prefer to regard them as midway stations on the way toward crystallization. To me it does not seem a far cry from Iffland's "Sturm- und Drangstücke" (1793) to Schlegel's "Sturm- und Drangperiode" (1800, 1803). Is the latter necessarily more technical than the former? Does the former necessarily refer more to emotionalism than the latter? It seems to me that such an assertion would go too far.

Finally I call attention to another early eighteenth-century use of *Sturm und Drang*. It is found in a letter of Heinse to Fritz

Jacobi, dated Rome, March 16, 1782²—of no later date, it would seem, than Professor Kurrelmeyer's passage. Heinse writes that Klinger is visiting him ("Jetzt nun hab ich Klingern hier"). Klinger has urged him to come to St. Petersburg and has promised him the position of librarian to the Grand Duke. Heinse is loath to accept and after recounting various reasons, continues: "und endlich sind noch andre Umstände dabey, die den ganzen Plan für mich zu einem vergeblichen Sturm und Drang machen." This use is interesting not only because of its early date but also because it reveals Heinse under the influence of Klinger, with his predilection for the term, which I believe the latter adopted in 1776 without much urging on Kaufmann's part, having previously revealed a penchant for the two words as such.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

University of Cincinnati.

THE MAN OF TASTE

In December, 1731, Pope published his "Epistle on Taste" to the Earl of Burlington. Like many others of Pope's satires, this one gave rise to other literary pieces which played with its subject and title. There was a satirical comedy, *Mister Taste the Poetical Fop, or the Modes of the Court, A Comedy, By the author of the opera of Vanelia or the Amours of the Great* (1732), published by E. Rayner and reissued the next year by "L. Gulliver," with the title *The Man of Taste*, but keeping the running title *The Poetical Fop; or the Modes of the Court*. There is also a poem called *The Man of Taste* (1733) by the Reverend James Bramston (1694?-1744) vicar of Harting and Lurgashall, Sussex. And finally there is a comedy by the Reverend James Miller (1706-1744), *The Man of Taste; or the Guardians* (1735).

The first of this series was anonymous. It was directed against Pope, who figures in it as "Mr. Alexander Taste," the ridiculous and deformed lover of Lady Airy (of course Lady Mary Wortley Montagu). On the title page appear the lines:

² *Wilhelm Heineses sämtliche Werke*, hrsg. v. Carl Schüddekopf, vol. 10, Leipzig, 1910, p. 154.

No more, O Pope, what Chandois builds, deride
 Because he takes not Nature for his guide,
 Since, wondrous critic! in thy form we see
 That Nature may mistake as well as he.

It was, according to its title page, "acted by a summer company near Twickenham" and was by the author of *Vanelia; or the Amours of the Great* (1732), which was "acted by a private company near St. James." This latter piece was one of a number which made scandalous literary capital over the amour of the Prince of Wales and the Honorable Anne Vane. The printed catalogue of the British Museum lists (in addition to *Vanelia*), *Vanella, The Fair Concubine: or the Secret History of the Beautiful Vanella* (1732); *Vanella in the Straw* (1732); and *Vanella, a Tragedy* (1736). Genest lists still another in which the lady is called Vanessa (x, 157). Apparently the author of this *Man of Taste* and of *Vanelia* was by trade a literary scandal monger, catering to a snobbish interest in the seamy side of high life. This appears in such subtitles as *Modes of the Court* and *Amours of the Great*, clearly intended to catch the vulgar. Doubtless too, "the summer company near Twickenham" and "the private company near St. James" were merely sily transparent allusions to actors in the comedies in real life, Pope and Lady Mary, and the Prince and Miss Vane. The first publisher, Rayner, if one may judge from occasional references to him in the public prints, was a man of dubious professional standing, and the second, "L. Gulliver," is a creature of the imagination. Lawton Gilliver, Pope's publisher, and book-seller to *The Grub-street Journal*, was often referred to jokingly as "Captain Gulliver," and this may have been an attempt to impose on the public and make it think him responsible for *The Man of Taste*. But obviously he was publishing no scurrilous satires on "Mr. Alexander Taste." Rayner was probably still the proprietor, since the "Gulliver" issue carries an advertisement of "Books lately published by E. Rayner."

The Reverend James Bramston's *Man of Taste*, is typically pro-Pope and anti-Dunce. It is an ironical poem on taste in all fields; in the section on literature it derides Blackmore, Bentley, Cibber, Curll, and Tindal; and praises Thomson, Swift, Milton, and Pope. It was reprinted in Dodsley's *Poems by Several Hands* (I, 286).

The third *Man of Taste*, by James Miller, is one of the usual

early eighteenth century comedies of wit, manners, and intrigue, and has no connection with Pope's Epistle. It has been distinguished from the earlier play in *Biographia Dramatica* and also in the catalogue of the British Museum, where the earlier title has appended to it the note, "A different work from J. Miller's comedy with the same title." A writer in *Notes and Queries* (Series II; XII, 293), however, ascribes to Miller not only the scandalous comedy of 1732, but also, and logically enough, *Vanelia*, since both were the products of one pen. Miller's biographer in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, accepting this ascription, also makes Miller the author of both plays, although he avoids giving him two distinct plays of the same name by listing the first with its original title, *Mister Taste, the Poetical Fop*. For some reason or other, Bramston and his poem seem to have kept clear of the tangle.

The ascription of the first comedy to Miller is of course absurd. His being a clergyman was, in the 1730's to be sure, no bar to his writing such pieces as this and *Vanelia*. Moreover, he had little luck in his profession, and had had to become a literary and dramatic hack to get a living. From this side alone, one might be unsuspicious of his authorship. But on the other hand he was a friend and admirer of Pope; was treated kindly by *The Grubstreet Journal*, which was for some time Pope's personal organ; and, it is almost certain, later became its editor. Surely he would not be one to hold up to public derision the moral and physical failings of "Mr. Alexander Taste," any more than Lawton Gilliver would have been one to publish such stuff.

J. T. HILLHOUSE.

University of Minnesota.

A NOTE ON CHAUCER'S YEOMAN

Line 104 of the *Prologue*, in speaking of the Yeoman, describes him bearing under his belt "a sheef of pecok-arwes, brighte and kene." Skeat, in his volume of *Notes to the Canterbury Tales*,¹ gives a number of parallel references to the peacock-feathered shafts.

I should like to call attention to two additional references, which to my knowledge have not been pointed out before. The first

¹ Works of Chaucer (1894), II.

occurs in a will dated London, April 20th, A. D. 1361, wherein John de Bonyndon or Bovyndon (?), apothecary, bequeathes "to John Pountz his kinsman, Richard Pountz, and Thomas, brother of Richard . . . sums of money and bows and arrows furnished with feathers of Pecok."²

The second passage is a part of the tale of "Owen et Lunet ou La Dame de la Fontaine" in J. Loth's standard translation of *Les Mabinogion*.³ It reads as follows: "Je me dirigeai vers la château; alors se présentèrent à ma vue deux jeunes gens aux cheveux blonds frisés . . . ils avaient à la main un arc d'ivoire; les cordes en étaient de nerfs de cerf; leurs flèches dont les hampes étaient d'os de cétacés avaient des barbes de plumes de paon; la tête des hampes était en or . . ."

EDITH SMITH KRAPPE.

Minneapolis, Minnesota.

A NOTE ON PARLEMENT OF THE THREE AGES 38

My lyame than full lightly lete I doun falle,
And to the bole of a birche my berselett I cowchide

The Parlement of the Thre Ages, 38-39.

Sir Israel Gollancz in his edition of *Parlement* (1915), an edition rich in its erudition and fine in its scholarship, glosses *lyame* (38) as "leash," i. e. the cord by which the hunter held his "limer," or scent-hound. In so doing, he is, I think, in error. If *lyame* be rendered by "leash," lines 38-39 would be read as follows: "My lyam (leash) then full lightly (quickly?) I let fall down, and to the bole of a birch I caused my bercelet to couch down," i. e. the leash was allowed to fall gently, because the slightest noise might have disturbed the stags close at hand. *Lyame* occurs again in line 61, where it is also glossed as "leash."

The process which the author describes is that of stalking the red deer with the aid of a bercelet,¹ or shooting-dog, for a shot

² *Calendar of Wills. Court of Husting*, ed. R. R. Sharpe (London, 1889-90), II, 39-40, roll 89 (147).

³ Loth, *Les Mabinogion du Livre Rouge de Hergest avec les variantes du Livre Blanc de Rhydderch* (Paris, 1913), II, 5-6.

⁴ Cf. *NED*. (s. v. *bercelet*, obs.), and *The Master of Game*, ed. W. A.

with the crossbow. The hunter's purpose is, of course, to obtain a view of the animal. The procedure which the hunter of our poem follows is, in the initial stages before the shot be fired, identical with that followed by the groom sent out with the lyam-hound, who goes to view the stag in his covert at early morn, in order that he may make his report to the hunting assemblage.

The directions how this should be done are given in the fifteenth century *Master of Game*, an English translation (with additions and subtractions here and there) of the *Livre de Chasse* (begun 1387) of Gaston Phébus, Count of Foix, made by Edward, second Duke of York:

And then shall the groom quest in the country that shall be devised to him the night before, and he shall rise in the dawning, and then he must go to the meating (pasturing) of the deer to look if he may see anything to his liking, *and leave his lymer in a certain place where he may not alarm them.*³ And thence he should go to the newly hewn wood of the forest or other places where he hopes best to see a hart, and keep always from coming into the wind of the hart, he should also climb upon a tree so that the hart shall wind nothing of him, and that he can see him further. . . . Then he should fetch his lymer and cast round . . . and take care that neither he nor his hounds make but little noise for dread lest he void.³

The important information which the quotation above gives is that the hound is *secured*, and not free.⁴

If the procedure of the hunter be as described above, Gollancz's glossing of *lyame* by "leash" can hardly stand. The hunter would not allow his leash to fall lightly to the ground, even though he did cause his dog to lie down at the foot of a birch tree. It is, of course, within the realm of possibility that the dog might have been so well-trained that he would never have risen, even though the deer which our poet describes had fled past him. But that happy result of canine education is very dubious. It is much more

and F. Baillie-Grohman, London, 1909, pp. 122, 204-205, for discussion of this term.

³ The italics are my own.

³ *Master of Game*, pp. 152-153.

⁴ For further evidence that the lyam-hound was secured in some way, see Tuberville's *Booke of Hunting* (Tudor and Stuart Library, Oxford, 1908), pp. 79-80.

probable that the dog was tied up, and that probability is strengthened by lines 60-61:

And I hyede to my hounde and hent hym vp sone,
And louset my lyame and lete hym vmbycaste.*

Had the dog been untied, the hunter would not have had to "hie" back; a call or whistle would have brought the animal up.

Lyame in line 38 is to be glossed not as "leash," but as "lyam-hound." The present form is defined by *NED.* (s. v. *lyam*, obs., 2) as a shortened form of *lyam-hound*. The use of this shortened form is attested by the following phrase from the Book of St. Albans (quoted in *NED.* s. v. *lyam*, obs., 2, as of date 1486): "A Sute of a lyam," and by its occurrence in the famous catalogue of dogs given by Edgar in *King Lear*.⁶ So glossed, the difficulties raised by taking the word to mean "leash" disappear, and lines 38-39 would be rendered as follows, *lete* being used in its causative sense (see *NED.* s. v. *let*, v¹., 13), and line 39 serving to amplify and extend line 38: "My lyam-hound then full lightly I caused to 'charge,' and to (against) the bole of a birch I caused my bercelet to couch."

HENRY L. SAVAGE.

Princeton University.

WAS BALZAC'S *ILLUSIONS PERDUES* INFLUENCED BY STENDHAL?

Balzac's *Illusions perdues* and Stendhal's *Le Rouge et le Noir* have as heroes young men who decide to make their way in the world by their wits only; consequently they make love to married women who are their social superiors; exposure by rivals merely results to their advantage; when they reach Paris, they measure at once the difference between its ideals and the ideals of their province, and resolve to master Parisian society; their good looks

* While it is probable that *lyame* in these lines refers to the dog, "leash" is a possible translation. The meaning of lines 60-61 may be that the poet after untying the hound, loosened his leash (either by lengthening it to give the dog more play, or by removing it entirely from his collar).

⁶ *King Lear* (New Variorum Ed.), III, vi, 66-71.

and their tailors lend them important assistance in their effort, and for a while they are successful; then disaster comes, self-imposed in the one case, incidental in the other. Here is considerable likeness, both of tone and trend. But is that likeness sufficient to suggest that Stendhal's novel might have influenced Balzac's?

Balzac began *Illusions perdues* in the summer of 1836. He first mentions it in a letter to Mme Hanska, dated July 13. It was published early in 1837, and continuations appeared in 1839 and 1843. But while his letters often allude to it during this period of seven years, they do not speak of his purpose in writing it until December 21, 1842, when he tells Mme Hanska:

J'aurai peint, je crois, le triple mouvement qui amène de la province à Paris les poètes, les nobles et les bourgeois. *Le Cabinet des Antiques*, *le Député d'Arcis*, et *Illusions perdues*, qui formeront deux volumes de la *Comédie humaine*, à eux seuls, représenteront bien notre époque.

The letter of July 13, 1836, had said: "en huit jours j'avais inventé et composé *les Illusions perdues*, et j'en avais écrit le tiers." During these days Mme de Berny was dying. Did Balzac's grief, recalling to him the days when he was tutor to her son and won her love, bring to his mind Julien Sorel's beginnings in Stendhal's story?

In his pages on the Besançon cathedral, Stendhal had written of its chapter: "On espérait beaucoup de la vieille présidente de Rubempré," a piece of pure persiflage, which Balzac could appreciate. For Alberthe de Rubempré was still well known. And did this malicious fling fix Balzac's attention on that name, so suited through its sonority to express the brilliant, showy personality he had conceived? And could "Lucien" have been suggested by Stendhal's "Julien"?

Le Rouge et le Noir contains a picture of friendship. Fouqué's devotion to Julien Sorel, though unavailing in its endeavor to dissuade him from the career he had marked out for himself, was unwavering. Balzac's description of Séchard's constant, self-denying affection for Lucien, and of his counsels, equally disregarded, is carried to much greater length. Yet could the latter have grown out of the former?

F. M. WARREN.

Yale University.

A NOTE ON BAUDELAIRE

Poe more than once hid the name of an Egeria within the mazes of a poem (*A Valentine, Enigma*). Did Baudelaire, who in so many things was obsessed by Poe's example, attempt this? If so, probabilities lead us to consider first the sonnet *Je te donne ces vers* (significantly left without a title), the final poem of the series celebrating his mistress Jeanne Duval:

JE te Donne ces vers afin que si mon Nom
 Aborde heureusement aUX epoques lointaiNEs,
 Et fait rêVer un soir les cervelles humaines,
 Vaisseau favorisé pAR un grand aiglon,
 Ta mémoire, pareiLle aux fables incertaines,
 Fatigue le lecteur ainsi qu'un tympanon,
 Et par un fraternel et mystique chaînon
 Reste comme pendue à mes rimes hautaines. . . .

Poe used a strict mathematical scheme which resulted in very bad verse. If Baudelaire put the name Jeanne Duval here, the quality of the poem shows that he must have chosen a far simpler method. Baudelaire's character, at once subtle and *mystificateur*, would not have left the result patent: his schema, in case he had one, would be irregular as well as simple.

Now the name Duval runs down the sonnet through the third word of each line (Donne . . . aUX . . . rêVer . . . pAR . . . pareiLle). The letters of JEANNE occur in every third word (if we shorten the first interval) either beginning the word or in its final syllable (Je . . . donnE . . . Afin . . . moN . . . heureusemeNt . . . lointaiNEs). They also occur divided between the beginning and the end of the first two lines (JE . . . Aborde . . . Nom . . . lointaiNEs).

I submit the above as a conjecture that is at least interesting. If Baudelaire did not do *literally* what he implies he did in the second quatrain, there is now no need of explaining the result mystically or of leaving it as a coincidence. Have we not the Influence of the Subconscious? I turn humbly to the psychologists!

LEWIS PIAGET SHANKS.

The Johns Hopkins University.

COLERIDGE MARGINALIA

In Dr. Williams' Library, Gordon Square, London, there are a few books which formerly belonged to the library of H. C. Robinson. Four of these contain marginalia by S. T. Coleridge: *Museum* von Jean Paul, Stuttgart und Tübingen, 1814; *Geist* — Jean Paul, Weimar und Leipzig, 1801; *Naturphilosophie* von F. W. J. Schelling, Jena und Leipzig, 1799; *Anthropologie* von Henrich Steffens, Breslau, 1822.

The marginalia are few and of very little interest, it seems. But I extract one from the fly-leaf of Steffens's *Anthropologie*, Erster Band, with the paragraph from pp. 14-15 to which Coleridge gives a reference.

Steffens: "Aber jenes Gefühl, welches uns in die Fülle der Natur versenkt, jenes heilige, reine Frühlingsgefühl, welches das quellende Leben der Natur, als das eigene, uns gibt, und alle Reichthümer, als unsere, ist das Fundament der Anthropologie. Wer dieses Gefühl, das reinste, das herrlichste das tiefste des Menschen, welches ihn nie ganz verläßt, welches eine wunderbare Freudigkeit über sein ganzes Daseyn verbreitet, festzuhalten vermag, der entdeckt unmittelbar, dasz hier die Quelle seiner wahren Freiheit, der Punkt ist, wo jene Scheinfreiheit, die er durch den trennenden Verstand, durch die selbstüchtigen Begierden im Gegensatz gegen die Natur thöricht behaupten möchte, völlig vernichtet wird, wo alle Ketten zersprengt, alle Wünsche erfüllt sind, alle Sehnsucht gestillt ist, indem das selig erweiterte Gefühl sich in und mit dem All über allen Wechsel des irdischen Daseyns erhaben fühlt."

S. T. C.: "Thirty years ago in the Ode entitled France and in the last stanza ending with

O Liberty! my spirit felt thee there!

I exprest the same thought; and as a Poet, had a right so to do. But when this genial Flush is gone by, what answer has it left behind to the heart-withering Facts truly stated on p. 10?"

Since Steffens discusses on p. 10 the facts of determinism, or "Nothwendigkeit," Coleridge is obviously making a recantation of some literary importance. He explicitly abjures the romantic naturalism of his youth.

T. M. RAYSOR.

The Johns Hopkins University.

REVIEWS

The Life and Correspondence of Lodowick Bryskett. By HENRY R. PLOMER and TOM PEETE CROSS. The University of Chicago Press, 1927. Pp. 89.

One of the most considerable of the many services rendered to Spenser scholarship by the late Dr. F. I. Carpenter was his insistence on the need for a careful revision of the current biography of the poet. In his *Reference Guide* (1923) he announced that Mr. H. R. Plomer was at work upon Bryskett, and he included, in the *Guide*, certain memoranda secured through Mr. Plomer's aid, supplementing his own important article on Spenser in Ireland in *MP.* in 1922. We now have before us, in a book published by aid of funds left for the purpose by Dr. Carpenter, the results of Mr. Plomer's further investigations.

The book gives a clear portrait of an important member of Spenser's circle, and, indirectly, sounder means for judging the circumstances amid which Spenser lived when he was writing the *Faerie Queene*. To be sure, most of the evidence is indirect. Though Spenser and Bryskett were associated, the poet does not figure in the correspondence which Mr. Plomer has transcribed. Bryskett seems to have been a person of some consequence, in pretty constant communication with men of rank in the government. He spoke frankly his mind concerning the management of Irish affairs by Elizabeth's ministers. The letters of 1580-82, in particular, bear out Spenser's own interpretation of the problem, a chaos due to the failure of government "to goe thorough with the reformation." Repeatedly Bryskett complains of the astounding neglect of Grey. The climax is reached in the letter to Walsingham in May, 1582, in which Bryskett sums up bitterly his feeling: "What can be sayd but that the secrett Judgement of God hangeth ouer this soyle, that causeth all the best endeavor of those that labor the reformation thereof to come to naught."

These letters should be read by all students of Spenser's *View of Ireland* or of his defence of Grey in the fifth book of the *Faerie Queene*. They are correctives to the view expressed some years ago by Mr. H. S. V. Jones to the effect that the "strong medicine" of Machiavelli meant nothing to Spenser and that he dealt merely with philosophical abstractions. Mr. Plomer has unearthed many valuable matters by printing in full documents that appear only in abstracts, frequently with the omission of their most illuminating parts, in the Calendars of State Papers. The book throws light on the nature of the various offices which Spenser held,

though here, again, the testimony is indirect. We have no letters by Spenser, or to him. We have no direct reference to him or to his work. Bryskett had literary tastes but they are not revealed in his letters. He held many small offices; he complained much; but he had contacts apparently lacking to Spenser. How barren must have been the poet's life had it not been for his absorption in his great epic!

It is perhaps because of the paucity of materials that bear directly upon the external aspects of Spenser's biography that the authors are impelled to resort, rather too frequently, to the sort of conjecture that Mr. Carpenter deplored. For example, we are told on p. 35 that Captain Norris and Warren St. Leger "were two of the company who met under Bryskett's roof, as described in the *Discourse of Civil Life*." Yet the most that Messrs. Plomer and Cross can do with reference to this supposed meeting, important to us because Bryskett says that Spenser was of the party, is to give evidence that all the persons *might* have been present. This of course is far from proving that they *were* present, or that the narrative is not fictitious. Indeed, the admission (p. 80) that three years must have passed between the events of the first day and those of the third day inevitably arouses the suspicion that no such meeting ever took place. Apart from their analysis of the introductory parts of the *Discourse*, the authors attempt no systematic study of it. They do not, for example, take into account the fact, pointed out by Professor Erskine, that some of the speeches attributed to Spenser in the dialogue are translated from Giralaldi, and that they represent sentiments which Spenser is pretty certain not to have held. The problem of the *Discourse* is by no means settled; the chapter dealing with it seems the least satisfactory of the book, although we have a right to expect, in a book titled as it is, as careful treatment of Bryskett's literary work as of the offices he held. As to the authenticity of the introductions to the parts of the dialogue, it must be remembered that Bruno, for example, introduced into similar dialogues references to persons whom he probably met in London, and he gives what appear to be accounts of real meetings of a philosophical group. Yet it would be a mistake to interpret these references literally. And Spenser himself, in *Colin Clout*, introduces dialogue in the same literary fashion, though we know that there was no such meeting as he describes. The *Discourse of Civil Life* has intimate relations to the plan and conduct of the *Faerie Queene*; it is a document of first importance in literary history; but we gain nothing by the speculation that it is a sort of short-hand report of discussions that actually took place while the *Faerie Queene* was in the making. The influence, I am inclined to think, is from the epic to the dialogue, not the reverse.

There are other evidences of a tendency to expand scanty materials or to preserve a largely fictitious connection with Spenser through speculation. Some of this is old gossip, such as the idea that Spenser lost a child at Kilcolman. Some of it is gratuitous, such as the statement that we have no record of their "many friendly meetings and heart to heart talks." If there is no record, why mention it? Indeed, the Bryskett revealed in these letters seems unlikely to have indulged in heart to heart talks, unless on the subject of his own fortunes. Even worse, in its revival of the biographical method which Carpenter justly condemned, is the quite unsupported statement (p. 61) that "If Bryskett was in London at the time of Spenser's death, we may be sure that he was not only at his bedside, but that he was one of the distinguished group of mourners . . . who . . . composed elegies and threw them into the grave together with the pens used in writing them."

In short it is for the documents themselves, hitherto inaccessible, that we are grateful for this book, and not for the interpretation of Spenser that is attempted. These documents have enabled the authors to construct a far more detailed biography than we can find elsewhere, not the least interesting part of which is the story of Bryskett's later years, based on the Salisbury MSS. at Hatfield House. Yet there are some omissions of available evidence even in this account. For example, there is no reference to the important fact that in 1590 Bryskett was granted two hundred pounds "for past services," the money to be paid out of the receipt of forfeitures of the Port of London (*C. S. P. Dom.*, 1581-90, p. 711), a record which may have some bearing on Bryskett's efforts to raise money for his debts as well as fees that he thought were due him. Again, in October of 1600, there is record of acquittance by Bryskett for one hundred pounds received from the secretary to Sir Robert Cecil (*C. S. P. Dom.*, 1598-1601, p. 482), to which I find no reference in the book. There are doubtless other clues in the domestic calendars; the authors appear to have confined their researches to the Irish state papers and to the Hatfield MSS.

The book shows evidence of haste in preparation. There is a serious typographical error in the third line of page 3, rendering the sentence unintelligible. The sentence near the top of page 15 is also in need of revision, and the sentence introducing the quotation at p. 17. We are told that the name of Elizabeth's Treasurer may be spelled in two ways; surely it is not too much to ask that the authors decide which spelling they prefer and then cleave to it. Yet we find the two spellings scattered quite impartially throughout the book, often in pairs on succeeding pages, as, for example, "Burleigh" on pages 13 and 29, followed by "Burghley" on pages 14 and 30. But the formula is reversed by "Burghley" on

p. 41 and "Burleigh" p. 43. The Spenser material, also, appears to have been got up hastily. It is a bit surprising to find Legouis almost solely depended upon as authority.

EDWIN GREENLAW.

La Science du Mot. A. CARNOY. Louvain, Editions "Universitas," 1927. Pp. vii + 426.

Those of us who had the good fortune, long years ago, to attend the lessons of Professor Michel Bréal at the Collège de France, can still recall the refreshing novelty of his discussions of the meanings of words, and their shifts of meaning. A genial skeptic on the subject of "phonetic laws," he saw a new and happily lawless field for linguists in that aspect of language which he christened "la Sémantique"; and finally he published an enlightening book under that title. Others have busied themselves more or less with the same sort of study, each from the point of view of his special interest. Notable is the work of Wundt, in his *Völkerpsychologie*; the names of Paul, Darmesteter, de Saussure, Nyrop, Vossler readily suggest themselves also. Yet none of these scholars has attempted a comprehensive exposition of the whole matter. Each has contented himself with culling curious specimens, or with gathering confirmative evidence for a particular doctrine. Even collectively, they have not made of Semantics a methodical science, to be considered on a par with Phonology and Morphology.

That task has been assumed by Professor Carnoy of the University of Louvain, a scholar well known for his writings on Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and Romance. Personally, too, he is known to many Americans, having spent some time in this country during the dark days. His studies and travels have given him a rich and varied fund of illustration, which, of course, is the indispensable stock in trade of any dealer in general linguistics. With modest caution, he describes his effort as tentative; his desire is to assist in laying the foundations of a real science, with a definition, a method, and a terminology of its own.

The lack of a technical nomenclature Carnoy attempts to supply by means of a systematically invented vocabulary, constructed on the principles of Greek composition, and based on the word *sêma*: for instance, *métasémie*, *métendosémie*, *ecsémie*, *prosémie*, *pêrisémie*, *aposémie*, etc. Some of these names either explain themselves or suggest a likely guess; others are unintelligible without explanation. The book is, however, so written that the reader does not need to memorize the strange terms, each of them being sufficiently defined whenever it occurs—a prudent course, since the terminology is the feature most exposed to objection. Yet when one works it

through, in the conspectus at the back of the volume, one hardly sees how it could be improved, provided one accepts the classification on which it is built. For the whole system hangs together.

The plan is conceived with the purpose of including eventually all aspects of signification and all modes of change. After a brief discussion of the origins of speech and the development of languages, the author takes up the relation of thought to expression, the associations that cluster about words, their grouping in hierarchies, the formation of derivatives. This static picture is a prelude to the real story, the dynamic process of growth. Two fundamental principles underly Carnoy's presentation. One is the assumption that men always have more notions than words, that the growth of vocabulary constantly lags behind the evolution of concepts. The other is the idea that alteration usually comes about through a shift of emphasis between the central significance of a word and some of its connotations. The range of association may be transferred; it may be increased; it may be diminished; certain connotations may be magnified at the expense of others; indeed, one of them may so swell as to supplant the original head.

Through its multitudinous and devious currents Carnoy follows the course of semantic change, always instructively and acutely. This or that philologist may—undoubtedly will—be inclined to put this or that phenomenon into a different category. This or that foreigner may criticize the interpretation of a word or phrase cited from his own idiom; for many are the languages from which examples are drawn, although French is naturally in the lead. Such little disagreements are inevitable. But no one at all interested in the psychology of speech will read the book without finding abundant food for profitable thought.

C. H. GRANDGENT.

Harvard University.

English Satire and Satirists. By HUGH WALKER, 1925, London: Dent, New York: Dutton. Pp. x + 325. \$2.25.

This new volume in the "Channels of English Literature" series is truly pioneer work.¹ As a manual for the student it will undoubtedly be serviceable. It gives due space to the various parts of the subject, and echoes the generally accepted judgments con-

¹ Since the days of Dryden there have been general essays on English satire. During the eighteenth century one might have read, for example, *An Essay on Satire* by Walter Harte (1730), *An Essay Towards Fixing the True Standards of Wit, Humour, Raillery, Satire, and Ridicule* by C. Morris (1744), *An Essay on the Use and Abuse of Satire* by Charles Abbot Tenterden (Oxford, 1786), or "An Essay on Satire" in G. A. Stevens' *Lecture on Heads* (Dublin, 1788). In the nineteenth century

cerning the merits of the principal satirists. Moreover, in all the chapters but the last it traces a fairly definite thread of progress.

But one seems to observe throughout the book one critical defect, an antipathy for the salient quality of satire, that "Satiric Spirit" which Mr. Walker capitalizes but condemns. He distrusts it so thoroughly that one constantly wonders at his perseverance in a study which must have caused him much pain. This aversion is everywhere apparent. In the excellent fifth and sixth chapters, which present a clear general view of Elizabethan satire, the lack of sympathy is suggested by the author's inclination to value the satirists for "geniality" and other personal virtues rather than for mastery of their caustic art. In the eighth, "Classical Satire to Dryden," it betrays the critic into apparent inconsistency. He expresses admiration for Dryden's "urbanity of manner" and, a few pages farther on, brands *Macflecnoe* as "the most severe of all personal satires in English."

The same unsympathetic approach makes Chapter X, on "Post-Restoration Prose Satire," thoroughly disheartening. It is true that Mr. Walker points out the notable figures in the mob of writers of satirical prose in the eighteenth century. But he either praises them for qualities that are not satiric, or condemns them for the very qualities of style and of thought that characterize truly great satire. Steele he applauds for geniality; Goldsmith for a trait indeed quaint in a satirist, "habitual kindliness." He finds that in *Jonathan Wild the Great*

Fielding maintains the irony with a relentlessness that, truth to tell, makes the book extremely unpleasant reading; though he has sufficient mercy on his readers to drop hints of his real vein from time to time, and in the end makes Wild die on the scaffold while the simple and trusting Heartfree recovers his fortune and lives in love and happiness with his family. (p. 210.)

Of Junius he writes:

It must be confessed that the famous *Letters*, great as is their talent,

there was one notable essay, *English Satirical Writers in Prose and Poetry since 1500* by Arthur J. Sargent (Oxford and London, 1897). More recently came Mr. Oliphant Smeaton's useful "Introduction" for his collection of *English Satires* (1907), Mr. Gilbert Cannan's highly impressionistic *Satire* (1914), and the able monograph of Mr. C. W. Previt -Orton, *Political Satire in English Poetry* (Cambridge, 1910). There have also been a number of American doctoral dissertations in the field of English satire. Three of these are especially important: *Verse Satire in England before the Renaissance* by Samuel Marion Tucker (New York, 1908), *The Rise of Formal Satire under Classical Influence* by Raymond MacDonald Alden (Philadelphia, 1899), and *Lord Byron as a Satirist in Verse* by Claude M. Fuess (New York, 1912). Until 1925, however, the only significant attempt to present a unified account of the whole history of English satire was that of James Hannay in his six lectures called *Satire and Satirists* (1854).

are unpleasant reading: venomous malignity and corrosive spite are qualities not beautiful to contemplate; and cold poison seems somehow to be more deadly than poison that is not cold. (p. 217).

A considerable part of the chapter is appropriately devoted to Swift. Concerning that tremendous pessimist, Mr. Walker seems convinced against his will. Two successive sentences from page 197 afford an extreme illustration of his attitude:

On the plea that he was unsound in mind Swift may be pitied, but not praised or admired.

There is no "brother near the throne" of Jonathan Swift: he is unrivalled among English prose satirists.

Imperfect sympathy likewise led the historian to deal somewhat perfunctorily with the satirists of the latter half of the eighteenth century, touching delicately the tainted verses of the dissipated Churchill, remarking on certain "stinging lines" of Cowper which are mere versified description of Hogarth's "Morning," rapidly disposing of such minor persons as Chatterton, Cambridge, Crabbe, "Peter Pindar," Gifford, Mathias, and the wits of the *Anti-Jacobin*, and utterly omitting the names of William Combe, William Mason, and Christopher Anstey, the author of the *New Bath Guide*.

Perhaps the most vivid demonstration of Mr. Walker's point of view is in his critical estimate of his fellow-Victorian, Thackeray:

Thackeray's heart pierced deeper than his head. He was stronger, not weaker, greater, not less, by reason of the restraints which the age laid upon him. *Jonathan Wild* would have been a far finer book than it is if Fielding had felt himself to be under similar restraints. . . . [The function of art] is to interpret the beautiful to men, and it may legitimately deal with the ugly only by way of showing up its opposite by contrast. (p. 299.)

In general, this book is the work of an optimist endeavoring to deal fairly with the history of a kind of writing that is almost inevitably pessimistic. It is task work rather than a labor of love, task work conscientiously performed by a scholar who has a constitutional distaste for sarcasm and harsh rebuke. His antipathy for the essential and distinguishing element of satire is unmistakably implied in such passages as:

In verse we instinctively expect beauty, and there is a reaction when we are disappointed and find instead censure; in prose the expectation is far less strong. (p. 113.)

Every form of literature is valued ultimately in proportion to the truth it embodies. Now romance embodies a deeper truth than realism—as the realists understand it. There is something of the Yahoo in humanity, but there is also something that responds to the *Serious Call*. . . . Satire is a relatively low form of literature, just because it embodies a relatively small element of truth. (p. 119).

The general plan of the "Channels" series has prevented Mr. Walker from annotating his text with more than a scant dozen foot-notes. This limitation seems decidedly unhappy, for more copious and more accurate bibliographical notes would indubitably increase the usefulness of his book. In its present form, it is certainly not a definitive critical history of British satire. As a preliminary survey, however, it is a good book worthy to stand on the shelf beside M. Léon Levraut's *La Satire (Evolution du genre)*.

ROBERT C. WHITFORD.

Know College.

An Introduction to Old French Phonology and Morphology (Revised and Enlarged). By FREDERICK BLISS LUQUIENS. Pp. 148. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1926.

This is the "second printing, second edition" of Professor Luquienes's useful manual for beginners in Old French, first published in 1909 and republished in a revised and enlarged edition in 1919. For a time the volume had been out of print. Since the work has been before the world of scholarship for more than fifteen years, it seems unnecessary to indicate its purpose and scope otherwise than by reference to the preface, where it is frankly stated that the book is a "skeletonized" translation of the Schwan-Behrens grammar, which—as Mr. Luquiens intimates—has gained and held a favored position as the basic working tool of Old French students. But the *Introduction* is more than that, for the author has added with a view to its use in our universities certain other material of an elementary character not available in the Schwan-Behrens work: an explanation of phonetic symbols; a glossary of technical terms used in philology; and a sketch of the organs of speech. He has likewise introduced two rather striking innovations, (1) the presentation of Old French verbs after the manner of grammars of Modern French, and (2) a system of drill-exercises for working out Old French etymologies that is invaluable as a device for fixing in the student's mind not only the principles involved but—almost literally—the location of every fundamental statement in Schwan-Behrens.

Undoubtedly some teachers of Old French hold the opinion that graduate students do not need (or perhaps even should not be permitted) the use of this sort of crutch, and with equal sincerity may maintain that the same amount of time might better be devoted to mastering the Schwan-Behrens itself. That has not been the reviewer's experience. In the first place, the student of Old French is often a first-year graduate student, who hasn't yet

learned how to work by himself. In the second place, he is frequently innocent not only of general linguistic ideas, but of a knowledge of phonetics or of the nature and purpose of philological study. In the third place, his knowledge of German—or even of French, in case the excellent French translation of Schwan-Behrens by M. Oscar Bloch is used—may not be sufficient to obviate entirely the technical difficulties of the original. In the fourth place, it seems to me desirable, as Mr. Luquiens has pointed out in the preface, to make it possible for students to acquire, before beginning to use the Schwan-Behrens, an “appreciation of its logicalness of structure,” which in the *Grammatik* itself, is “all but obscured by the complexities of detail unavoidable in an advanced grammar.” Finally, and perhaps principally, there seems to me to be a distinct saving of time, rather than a loss, in using the Luquiens book as a bridge. Students appear to get a better and earlier comprehension of the larger book, to use it more readily and systematically, after a study of the *Introduction*, than when they are literally pitchforked into a work of the importance, magnitude, and complexity of the Schwan-Behrens *Grammatik*.

Everyone knows, of course, that teachers of Old French ordinarily prepare the ground for the leap into philology, as represented by the Schwan-Behrens or some other Old French grammar, by a series of preliminary lectures which serve the same purpose as the Luquiens book. May one not ask, however, whether it is not needlessly adding to the burdens of graduate students—already too often reduced to the status of mere group-amanuenses—to compel them to take careful lecture-notes on material which is readily accessible in printed form? The preliminary meetings of the class might then be devoted to actual work with the tools of the craft rather than hurried note-taking and the accumulation of a mass of pre-digested material.

What is written above does not mean that the Luquiens manual is a perfect instrument for its purpose. The author himself never implies this and expressly invites the suggestions of its users. The reviewer offers the following:

1. Students could with profit be introduced by reference in the text, or, if that is impossible, by the inclusion of a brief bibliography, to such useful works as that of Jespersen on general linguistics, Ripman's convenient *Elements of Phonetics*, Bourciez's and Zauner's manuals of comparative Romance linguistics, Sturtevant's *Linguistic Change*, and others that will suggest themselves. Nyrop and Meyer-Lübke are mentioned in the preface. I believe that it would be especially helpful also to give not merely mention but considerable space to Grandgent's *Introduction to Vulgar Latin*, a book which is not only scholarly and accurate but eminently usable and easily accessible. This suggestion is made with full

realization of the existence of complete bibliographies elsewhere, including of course the Schwan-Behrens grammar itself.

2. The text might well be enriched, within reasonable space-limits, by references to parallel developments in Italian or Spanish or Old Provençal, or even—for general linguistic phenomena—to English or “American.”

3. It would seem pedagogically desirable to list Classical Latin forms before Vulgar Latin forms both in the text and in the exercise-system of the appendix, rather than the reverse, not only because it is the chronological order, but because it is reasonable to assume that students—unless they have already had Vulgar Latin—will more readily recognize Classical Latin forms and meanings.

4. A little more material on Old French dialects might be included to advantage, in view of the importance of some of these dialects—for example, Picard, Champenois, Norman-French—in medieval literature and in view of the inclusion of the extremely valuable Part III (on dialects) in recent editions of Schwan-Behrens. This is a relatively unimportant point, however, because the study of O. F. dialects would naturally follow a thorough grounding in Central French.

5. I do not agree that the inclusion of an index would be “detrimental” to a solid comprehension of the logical structure of the Schwan-Behrens grammar and, by implication, of this book, as Mr. Luquiens affirms in his preface. On the part of anyone else, that statement would be a reflection on the value of his work. The logical structure of the treatise is beautifully clear as it stands; and the index-habit is one never to be discouraged, however potent the arguments against it may appear to be.

A few errors and misprints still remain. I have noted the following: p. 38, par. 84, O. F. *venir*, not *venire*; p. 42, par. 105, **capu* need not be starred, as *capus* is attested;¹ p. 45, par. 133, “pronunciation” is misspelled; p. 68, par. 282½, *plānte*, not *plānte*; *plāte*, not *plāte*; p. 87, par. 332. the cedilla is omitted in *ico* and *co* both in the heading and in the text; p. 96, a “Week (sic) conjugation” would be a rarity indeed; p. 99, l. 1, supply a hyphen at the end of the line.

In conclusion, may I not express my belief that the book has more than justified its existence and the painstaking labor that its author has put into it; and further voice the hope that it may prosper to such an extent that a third and further revised edition may become feasible.

HENRY GRATTAN DOYLE.

George Washington University.

¹ But not **capum*. See Grandgent. *op. cit.*, par. 285.

The Astrological Works of Abraham Ibn Ezra. By RAPHAEL LEVY.
The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and
Languages, Vol. VIII, 1927. 172 pp.

The study of Judeo-Romance lexicography received its first impetus from E. Böhrmer and A. Darmesteter in the early seventies; they were followed by such men as Schlessinger, Gruenwald, Lambert, and Brandin. This field of research has recently been brought to a considerable degree of development through the labors of Professor D. S. Blondheim, who is probably the scholar best qualified today to direct investigations in this subject. It is under his direction that Mr. Levy prepared this dissertation, with frequent aid from other authorities. The work is divided into two main divisions: a discussion of the complete astrological writings of Abraham ibn Ezra (b. 1089-d. 1167), a Spanish Jew who traveled extensively, as well as of the translations of his works; secondly, a glossary of the words used in the French translation of Abraham's "Beginning of Wisdom," made by Hagin li Juis. This translation was dictated to a scribe, Obert de Montdidier, in the house of Henri Bate, at Malines during the month of December, 1273.

The first division contains an accurate and extremely interesting discussion of all that pertains to Abraham ibn Ezra. I have only one important criticism: the distribution of emphasis could be better. Mr. L. might have arranged his material somewhat differently to bring out the importance of Hagin. As it is, we feel that he lies buried under Abraham and the Latin translator Petrus de Abbano. Too much space, perhaps, is given to the latter.

The second division is of great value. It lists a number of words completely lacking and others ill defined in Godefroy and the various *lexiques*. There is also supplementary information on certain words correctly treated in Godefroy. Of the first class we should mention *agabois* 'mockery,' *chauvissure* 'baldness,' *milonnenetes* 'mediation,' *omeur* 'odor,' *vermelesce* 'vermilion,' and *vision* 'face.' There are five of these words which are of a sexual nature. In the second and third groups we are attracted particularly by *accomençal* 'beginning,' *aprevostir* 'to appoint as head,' *bonigier* 'to do good,' *eigier* 'to cultivate,' and *emploial* 'end.' Each word in this glossary is defined and followed by the corresponding word in the Latin translation of Petrus, also by the Hebrew original of Abraham. Unfortunately the few Arabic words used by Hagin are dismissed as such and Mr. L. makes no effort to qualify them. They are *alaas* 'adamant,' *alsaeri* 'Syrius,'¹ *Samach alazel* 'Spica Virginis,' *samach alremaih* 'Arcturus,' and *altamesaih* 'crocodile.' The correct Arabic forms, which Mr. L.

¹ For information on the Arabic star names cf. *Ulugh Beg's Catalogue of Stars*, ed. by E. B. Knobel, Carnegie Institute, Washington 1917.

does not give, are: *al-mās*, *as-si'rā*, *as-simāk al-'āzal*, *as-simāk ar-rāhmih*, and *at-timsah* (pl. *at-tamāsih*). The corrupted medical terms used by Hagin all resemble corrupted Greek more than Arabic. The printing of this book is excellent, as we have come to expect in the Johns Hopkins Studies.

URBAN T. HOLMES.

University of North Carolina.

Rambles with Anatole France. By SÁNDOR KÉMÉRI (Mme Georges Bölöni), translated from the Hungarian by EMIL LENGYEL. Philadelphia and London, J. P. Lippincott Company, 1926. 335 pp.

The title of Mme Bölöni's book, *Rambles with Anatole France*, is no misnomer. In the opening chapters we meet France at Villa Saïd and accompany him on a pilgrimage to his habitual haunts in Old Paris. Then we pass to Italy where the Master goes to free himself from his depressing thoughts after the death of Mme de Caillavet in 1910. The concluding chapters are devoted to a meeting of France and Rodin at Villa Saïd, to the former's trip to South America in 1909, and a visit paid to him by Mme Bölöni after the war.

The author of the present volume was secretary to France during the months which followed the death of Mme de Caillavet, an important period in the novelist's career; therefore, her book promised to be interesting from more than one standpoint. We regret that Mme B. has not thought it possible or fitting to lift the veil of mystery spread about the relations of France and Mme de Caillavet during the last years of the latter's life. However, the short allusion made to this obscure point in France's biography is pregnant with meaning in spite of its reticence. The words "cruel feeling of self-reproach," "self-accusing grief," "soul's doubts" used to describe the master's state of mind carry with them a certain weight of evidence. We find in them a confirmation of what Mme Jeanne Maurice Pouquet would have us infer from the sad tone of the last pages of her *Salon de Madame Arman de Caillavet*, 1926. The details of the problem, however, are still to be unravelled.

Mme B.'s book reflects a certain originality of view inasmuch as she emphasizes in the character of France an element which the other biographers have merely touched upon. In her *Rambles*, France is not only a sensual lover of life and beauty, a humanist and sceptic, but also an intensely introspective and sentimental nature, assailed by gloomy moods. The stress laid here is not in accord with the previous character studies of the master. A few cursory

remarks will show quite convincingly that the sentimental element in France's character has been considerably exaggerated. In 1910, he was working on *Les dieux ont soif* and *La révolte des anges*, which are among the most brutal and cynical of his novels and additional circumstantial evidence contrary to her contention can be gleaned from Mme B.'s own book, for her style is not one which wins us by its naturalness and simplicity. Highly florid and prolix, it bears the stamp of a sentimental and effusive nature. This accounts most likely for her sketching so novel a portrait of France. An ardent admirer of the novelist, she has seen him through herself, in the mirror of her own feelings. Practically every chapter is permeated with shallow and morbid moralizations. Bathos and unrestrained emotionalism know no bound in the story of *The Little Red Coat*. The chapters entitled *In the Forest of Dante*, *Two Old Friends Meet* (Rodin and France), and certain portions of the pages *On the Pincio of Rome*, if taken at face value, would afford numerous and conclusive manifestations of a complete moral disintegration and of an absolute lack of intellectual virility on the part of one of the most serene of contemporary French thinkers. For instance, in Naples, the master cannot bear the sight of lambs with slashed throats (161). Brought to consciousness by a green lizard creeping on the earth, in the forest of Dante, he falls into a melancholy mood and ends with the resolution not to be sentimental (p. 229). At another time, he feels an irrepressible desire to visit the cathedral at Rheims, expressing his fear that it might be damaged by an earthquake or a furious tempest, or that he might go blind or die (p. 281). According to Mme B., France "knew why his hands were interesting,—from work, meditation, and suffering." He once told her so (p. 297).

Is the man of these moods the creator of the bloody Evariste Gamelin, the violent satirist of *L'île des pingouins*, the strenuous Cyclops who, but for his cynical commiseration, would have enveloped humanity and its sordidness in one mighty act of all-consuming contempt? Of course, we cannot deny the presence of a pronounced streak of genuine melancholy in the author of *Le crime de Sylvestre Bonnard*, *Abeille*, *Le livre de mon ami*, *Le lys rouge*, and *Crainquebille*, but until now, we have been used to consider the sceptical mood as most characteristic of him. So long as we possess no indisputable evidence to the contrary, we shall continue to consider the humanist and sceptic to be the true Anatole France. To the rather gentle and romantic figure with which Mme B. makes us acquainted, we prefer the coarser and pettier master of Brousson and of Le Goff, a man marred with more shortcomings but living most intensely and possessing a most complex personality.

J. M. CARRIÈRE.

Marquette University.

Acta Philologica Scandinavica. Tidsskrift for nordisk sprogforskning. Udgivet med understøttelse af Rask-Ørsted Fondet af Johs. Brøndum-Nielsen og Lis Jacobsen under medvirkning af Bengt Hesselman Uppsala, Finnur Jónsson Köbenhavn, Axel Kock Uppsala, Sigurður Nordal Reykjavík, Magnus Olsen Oslo, Hugo Pipping Helsingfors. I Aargang Gyldendalske Boghandel Köbenhavn 1927.

We have here to welcome a periodical started at Copenhagen and appearing quarterly with approximately 100 large octavo pages, printed on fine paper with beautiful type, intended to deal with Scandinavian philology ancient and modern.

The chief editors, Professor Brøndum-Nielsen and Dr. Lis Jacobsen, are philologists of acknowledged merits, especially in the field of Danish philology proper; and the collaborators are among the greatest authorities in Scandinavian (Norse) philology in each of the five Scandinavian countries, respectively, at the present time. Furthermore, it seems, in order to add still more dignity to the titlepage, the pictures of three great scholars of times past, viz. the famous Dane R. Kr. Rask, the Swede J. Ihre, and the Norwegian S. Bugge, are placed in a circle in a brotherly fashion below the prominent scholars of our own day. Here one may ask, "Why was the Icelander Sveinbjörn Egilsson, author of *Lexicon poeticum antiquae linguae septentrionalis*, excluded from this 'limbus patrum'?" I, for one, think that he well deserved a place there as the first scientific interpreter of the dark scaldic poetry of Old Norse. But this is not essential, of course. What is essential is the way in which the editors keep the promise of the title page. One may get a little notion of that by glancing at the contents of volume 1.

There are, in the first place, articles dealing with the language and the ethnology of the ancient Germans (Teutons), e. g. Professor G. Neckel's "Germanische Syntax," Professor T. E. Karsten's "Zur Kenntnis der ältesten germanischen Lehnwörter des Ostseefinnischen," and Dr. S. Feist's "Neuere Germanenforschung." And there are articles on the Scandinavian runic monuments, by Dr. E. Noreen: "L'inscription runique des Bractéates de Åscatorp et Väsby," and the splendid one by Dr. Lis Jacobsen herself: "Wimmer's Farmerstones," further articles deal with history of language and etymology; by Professor D. A. Seip, "Reduzierter Vokal nach kurzer Stammsilbe im Altnorwegischen"; by Dr. E. Wessén, "Notes pour servir à l'histoire de quelques mots Suédois"; and by Professor R. E. Zachrisson, "OE *dæn(n)* M. Dutch *dan* and the name of *Danemark*" (recording among other things a number of Old and Middle English placenames containing this element).

Then there are two studies in Scandinavian textual questions ancient and modern: Professor R. C. Boer's "Studien über die Snorra Edda. Die Geschichte der Tradition bis auf den Archetypus," and Professor H. Brix's "The Earliest Impressions of Holberg's Comedies."

There are still other contributions, of which I shall mention only that of the American scholar Professor T. G. Flom: "The Writing of *n* and *nn* in hand iii. of the *Þiðreks saga*," and the interesting little article of the Englishman E. V. Gordon: "Scarborough and Flamborough," in which he tries to identify the founders of those towns with the Icelandic vikings, the poet *Kormákr* and his brother *Þorgils skarði*.

Finally, there is a "Bibliography of Scandinavian Philology" for 1925-26 by Mag. art. Paul Andersen and Mag. art. Harry Andersen on the basis of reports sent in by the authors of the works cited.

The new periodical is to be recommended to everybody who is interested in Scandinavian philology, and particularly to Americans, because it is the only periodical in the field exclusively using the more widely known languages of English, French, and German. And certainly it is a pity that an English-speaking philologist should not be able to get acquainted with his Scandinavian colleagues, for in their scientific method they are second to none, so that one may often read their works with profit, even if the problems they are discussing are only of secondary interest.

S. EINARSSON.

The Johns Hopkins University.

EDWARD FITZGERALDS *Rubaiyat des Omar Khayyam*. Letzte Fassung, deutsch von H. W. NORDMEYER. Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag Potsdam, 1926.

This new German version of the famous English masterpiece once characterized by Charles Eliot Norton as "not a copy, but a reproduction, not a translation, but the re-delivery of a poetic inspiration" is a contribution by an American university teacher to the literature of his native land. Intimate living contact of its author with the language of the original is thus assured before we open its pages. The fulfilment of the second prerequisite of a translation of a great work of literature, that it should always be a labor of love, inspired by aesthetic and spiritual kinship with the original, is doubly attested by the author's introduction. It proves him both a profound inquirer into the philosophy of the

Persian poet-sage and an ardent admirer of FitzGerald as the incomparable modern interpreter and poetic re-creator of Omar's moods and thoughts.

Now as to the translation itself as a work of art. After a most favorable first impression, the reviewer has compared it carefully, line by line, with the original and the best of previous German renderings. In his judgment, Nordmeyer comes nearer than any of his predecessors to satisfying the third, and most essential *sine qua non*, literary excellence and charm without undue sacrifice of fidelity to the original in content and form. He alone among German translators has attained a perfect reproduction of the rhythmic structure of the original. Its masculine rhymes as well as the masculine ending of the third, normally "silent" line are everywhere preserved; not, indeed, as easy task in German. Where, for once, FitzGerald himself departs from this scheme, his interpreter, with true artistic instinct, avoids an irregularity which, while accepted in an original masterpiece, might easily mar a translation. Needless to say, this rhythmic superiority of Nordmeyer's version might also have proved a handicap. It is the more admirable that, taking the various translations as a whole, none is equal to Nordmeyer's in its fidelity to the English text or in poetic beauty and appeal. Among the numerous quatrains which the reviewer has starred in his copy, the 20th may serve to exemplify how far Nordmeyer has succeeded in transfusing poetic beauty from one language into another:

Und dieses duftge Grün, das weichbeschwingt
den Saum des Ufers da wir ruhn umringt—
O lehne linde hin . . . wer weisz wie süß
die Lippe war, der es vielleicht entspringt. . . .

A few marginal queries in the reviewer's copy indicate that here and there he believes the skill and resourcefulness of such a translator capable of a still closer approach to the original. In two instances he would certainly suggest a revision. In quatrain 59 the rendering of FitzGerald's *with logic absolute* by *folgernd unbeirrt* seems somewhat strained and, at first, even a bit obscure. And in quatrain 73 which, quite in keeping with those immediately preceding, stresses the eternal immutability of predestined fate, Nordmeyer's last two lines

Wahrlich, der Schöpfung erstes Frührot schrieb
was keiner liest bis zum Posaunenton!,

while impressive in themselves, are not an adequate rendering of

And the first Morning of Creation wrote
What the Last Dawn of Reckoning shall read.

This grandiose conception of immutability, reminding one vividly

of Spitteler's *Ananke* in his *Olympischer Frühling*, seems here weakened into one of mere inscrutability. The translator, no doubt, had no such intention, but his last line certainly is alien to the dominant thought of the quatrain, well brought out in the first line of Bodenstedt's translation from the original Persian: *Urewig vorgezeichnet ist der Dinge Kern*.

The beautifully printed and bound little volume bears the dedication: A. R. Hohlfeld in Madison, Wisconsin in Verehrung und Dankbarkeit zugebracht. It would not be amiss if future editions of this admirable translation went beyond this mere intimation of its German-American origin.

A. W. BOESCHE.

Cornell University.

The Child Actors. By HAROLD NEWCOMB HILLEBRAND. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. XI, Nos. 1, 2; 1926. Pp. 355.

The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company. By THOMAS WHITFIELD BALDWIN. Princeton University Press, 1927. Pp. xii+464.

These two books are significant signs of the interest in environing conditions of the Elizabethan drama, especially those so far the least investigated, the business management and the actors.

Professor Hillebrand's materials, methods, and problems are of a type more familiar than Professor Baldwin's. His new materials are mainly records of lawsuits, his problems those of company history. An introductory chapter emphasizes the advantage of child actors in shows and pageants. Succeeding chapters present the history of the various children's companies, not so much giving a detailed account as correcting and supplementing what has already been done. One mistake corrected may be mentioned in even so brief a review as this because it is so common: Harvey's irony in calling Lyly vicemaster of Paul's has been taken seriously; there never was such an office. Professor Hillebrand's new materials are mainly papers in several lawsuits, none of fundamental importance perhaps, but all illuminating, especially as to the history of the Children of the Queen's Revels about 1604. He calls attention also to a previously known but little used lawsuit of 1623, which shows that Philip Henslowe and probably Edward Alleyn were not opposed to but actively concerned in Rossiter's theater at Puddlewharf in the Blackfriars. Among other valuable matters are an unusually full discussion of Sebastian Westcote, including an ascription to him of *The Contention of Liberality and*

Prodigality; denial of Wallace's theory that Udall wrote *Jacob and Esau* but a tentative ascription to him of *Jack Juggler*; argument against Fleay's idea that *Like Will to Like* was the cause of Edward's turning from comedy; proof that the second Blackfriars did not open till 1600; and so on. The most generally interesting chapter is the last, which summarizes the place and importance of the child actors. From 1515-80 they led in the development of the drama in England. In these years the principal plays were written for them by their masters, and were within their powers. But from 1600-16 the children's companies were only apes to the men's. The drama had gone on to heights of dramatic and tragic intensity where the children could not follow. Their authors, professional playwrights, turned to satiric comedy, and satire was their undoing. In an appendix, besides reprinting some of his new documents, Professor Hillebrand gives a complete and helpfully annotated chronological list of plays given by children.

The book is attractively written, it is based on wide and careful research, and its evidence is clearly and reasonably presented. The subject is both confusing and important, and the book is a useful assistance in clearing it up.

Professor Baldwin has found a subject concerning Shakespeare on which almost nothing has been done. Theoretically everybody has admitted the powerful influence which must be exerted upon any dramatist who writes continuously for a permanent company. But nobody until Professor Baldwin has treated the matter thoroughly as it affected Shakespeare.

One reason for this neglect is, perhaps, that it requires a really unusual combination of careful research, skilful inference, and historic imagination to secure any results. Professor Baldwin has brought to the problem all three. In his first chapters he discusses the organization and business management of Shakespeare's company, which he presents as a true guild, with masters, journeymen, and apprentices, slightly modified by the exigencies of operating a theater. Thus there were the housekeepers, who owned the theater, some of whom were also actors; the actors—about 1595 nine of them, later twelve; the apprentices, apprenticed at about the age of ten to individual members of the company, playing the women's parts till they were too old to continue them, and graduating at about twenty-one to become members of the company if there were at the time vacancies in their "lines"; and the hired men, including the players of lesser parts, the musicians, and that important personage, the prompter. Perhaps Professor Baldwin's basic point is that this organization was a stable and permanent one; even the hired men remained with the company for years. It was indeed more than a guild; it was a clan, an organization of friends, who not only worked together, but lived as neighbors to each other.

It is this permanency of organization that permits further inferences. On the basis of available actor-lists and contemporary connections of certain actors with certain parts, Professor Baldwin works out "lines" of parts, and follows them through Shakespeare's plays. His lists in which he assigns to definite actors the parts in the plays given by Shakespeare's company of Beaumont and Fletcher, Jonson, and Shakespeare are admirable condensations of information. He makes little of the doubling of parts of which Julia Engelen makes so much in the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 1926 (to be continued in 1927); perhaps this should be more taken into account, but it could not have much affected the principal roles. Some of Professor Baldwin's assignments are admittedly made on very slight grounds, and he has had to proceed much by inference. He also makes much use of hints in the text concerning the personal appearance and age of the characters. Even allowing for make-up, he thinks that day-light and the close proximity of the audience would lead Shakespeare to depend upon it as little as possible.

On the whole his conclusions carry conviction. It is a little difficult to see one man (Thomas Pope) as Mercutio, Falstaff, Petruchio, Shylock, Benedick, Casca, Jacques, Iago, and Gloucester in *King Lear*, but the author argues his case well. And even if one does question such individual lists, the general conclusions seem sound enough and are of fundamental importance. Shakespeare was the hired dramatist of the company. He had to meet its desires and suit its powers, and carefully to adapt his plays to his actors. Each play had to have a definite number of leading parts; speaking generally, up to 1594 five were necessary; later, as apprentices became trained, more were added. For apprentices still in training, Shakespeare had to adapt his women's parts to their developing powers. The clown's parts for Kemp—this has been pointed out before—had to differ from those for Armin who succeeded him. About this time, also, the acting powers of the company became more predominantly tragic than comic, and we have the series of great tragedies—a more credible explanation than the old "out of the depths" or gloom over the machinations of the "dark lady." And when the company took over the Blackfriars they tried to hold the audience by carrying on the sort of plays to which Beaumont and Fletcher had accustomed it, and we have Shakespeare's tragi-comedies. Professor Baldwin is not so foolish as to offer these as the only explanation of Shakespeare's different types of plays, nor to deny his own great influence upon the company, but certainly their influence upon him has never before been so adequately estimated.

GEORGE F. REYNOLDS.

University of Colorado.

Studien zur Verskunst des jungen Klopstock. Von G. C. I. SCHUCHARD. Tübinger Germanistische Arbeiten. Zweiter Band. W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1927.

Die umsichtigen Studien Schuchards geben ein im Ganzen überzeugendes Bild von der Bedeutung und Behandlung des Hexameters zur Zeit Klopstocks. Die Minderwertigkeit der Versgebung der ersten drei Gesänge des *Messias* erklärt er mit Recht aus der Schwierigkeit, welche eine Umschmelzung der Prosafassung mit sich brachte. Verse derselben Jahre, wenn freigeschaffen, sind einwandfrei. Dabei führt in der Entwicklung des Dichters eine souveräne Behandlung des Metrums zu freien Rhythmen, während später eine strengere Schematisierung (wie das übrige im reifen Alter durchaus natürlich ist) einsetzt und zugleich ein Hang zu Inversion und den unglücklichen 'Spondäen.'

Eine Schwäche der Arbeit Schuchards liegt in der bewußten Ausschaltung des Melodischen. Während ich die ersten 60 Seiten fast ohne Widerspruch las, solange ich nämlich den *Messias* nicht selbst zur Hand hatte, drängten sich mir im Zusammenhange der Verse sofort zahlreiche Abweichungen von Schuchards Tongebung auf. *Messias* II, 820-821 sind meinem Empfinden nach durchaus keine so schweren Verstöße, wenn man sie nicht wie der Verfasser liest:

Gótt, Verdérber der Wésen, die du óhn' ihr Wóllen erschúfest!
Ríef er ím Hínabsehn, doch da wúrdé kein tótdendes Féuer.

sondern

Gott, Verdérber der Wésen, die dú ohn ihr Wóllen erschúfest!
Ríef er im Hínabsehn, doch da wúrdé kein tótdendes Féuer.

Die Betonung der Präposition 'ohn,' sowie die Verurteilung solcher Formen wie 'daurte,' 'feyrten,' 'feyrlichen' ließen vermuten, daß der Verfasser von süddeutscher Akzent- und Melodiegebung ausginge. Außerdem wird er aber—wie sein Lehrer Heusler—der häufigen Gegenwirkung der Tonstufen nicht gerecht. Hochtou auf 'Mut' und 'Er' und schematischer Akzent auf 'und' machen aus den folgenden beiden Reihen durchaus annehmbare Verse:

III, 153. Jésu(m) vielleícht. Mut | und ein kühnes entschlóssenes Wésen.

III, 517. Sálem ságt es und schwíeg. Er | und die Séráphim blíeben.

Die tonale Kurzatmigkeit der ersten drei *Messias*gesänge (Mangel an langen Tonbögen und monotones Absinken) steht im stärksten Gegensatz zu dem auftönigen Spannen der Melodie selbst über die Verseinheit hinaus in den späteren. Ich vermute, daß gerade von dieser Seite her das Problem sich noch weit vertiefen ließe, und

hoffe, daß der Verfasser in der versprochenen Weiterführung seiner Untersuchungen die melodischen Hilfsmittel Mut[und nicht mit Heuslerscher Einseitigkeit auch ferner ausschalten wird.

Johns Hopkins University.

ERNST FEISE.

Die Bedeutungsgleichheit der Altenglischen Adjektiva und Adverbia mit und ohne -lic (-lice) (= Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 62), von DR. KARL UHLER, Heidelberg, 1926.

In this monograph, Dr. Karl Uhler attempts to prove that Old English Adjectives and Adverbs ending respectively in *-lic* and *-lice* are substantially identical in meaning with the corresponding simple (uncompounded) words; that, for example, there is no appreciable difference in meaning between the Old English adjectives *riht* and *rihtlic* or between the Old English adverbs *rihte* and *rihtlice*. On this question two opposing views had been held, according to Dr. Uhler (pp. 5-7). Dr. Moritz Scheinert, in his article, "Die Adjektiva im Beowulfepos als Darstellungsmittel" (Paul und Braune's *Beiträge*, xxx, 1905, pp. 345-430), § 161, held that the adjectival form in *-lic* indicated a weakening of the meaning of the corresponding simplex, as in the New High German *ärmlich* and *röthlich* as compared with *arm* and *roth*. On the other hand, Jakob Grimm (III, 122) thought that there was no appreciable difference in meaning between the simple and the compound of such adverbial pairs as *rihte* and *rihtlice*. Dr. Uhler's monograph is the first detailed attempt to settle the question at issue.

For his theory of the substantial identity of meaning between these simples and compounds Dr. Uhler offers several cogent reasons. In otherwise almost identical passages, he finds the simple and the compound forms used interchangeably, as in Wulfstan's *Homilies*, 73. 8 (and *riht* is, ðæt ælc cristen man eac oðerne lufie and healde mid rihte) as compared with the *A. S. Laws*, 473. 31 (and ðonne is *rihtlic* eac, ðæt ure ælc oðerne healde mid rihte), for the adjective; or in Alfred's *Boethius*, 135. 8 ff. (ac on ðæm hi habbað genoh to ongitanne, ðæt se scippend and se waldend eallra gesceafta welt and *rehte* gesceop eall ðæt he gesceop) beside 125. 26 ff. of the same text (ac ðu ne scealt no twiogan, ðæt swa good sceppend and waldend eallra gesceafta *rihtlice* gesceop eall ðæt he gesceop), for the adverb. Sometimes this interchange is found within the same sentence, as in Alfred's *Pastoral Care*, 176. 11 ff. (and on oðre wisan sint to manianne ða ðe ða word ðære halgan æ *ryhte* ne ongietað, on oðre ða ðe hie *ryhtlice* ongietað).

Again, Dr. Uhler cites numerous examples of such interchange of simple and of compound in passages that are similar though not identical, as in the *A. S. Laws*, 40. 43 (dem ðu *rihte* and *swiðe emne*) as contrasted with Ælfric's *Homilies*, II, 322. 2 (ge manna bearn, demað *rihtlice*); or in Alfred's *Pastoral Care*, 184. 10 ff. (ðonne mon ðonne ongiete ðæt he *ryhte* gedemed habbe) and 44. 20 (gif him ðonne God *ryhtlice* and *streclice* deman wille), in each of which latter passages God is the subject, in whose correctness of judgment no diminution is possible.

At times one manuscript has the simplex, and another has the compound, as in Alfred's *Pastoral Care*, 138. 24 (Hatt. MS.: *swiðe ryhte* wæs ðæm sacerde forboden, ðæt he his heafod sceare; Cott. MS.: *swiðe ryhtlice* wæs ðæm sacerde forboden, ðæt he his heafod sceare).

Finally, according to Dr. Uhler, often the same Latin word is translated now by the simplex and now by the compound, as *recte* by *rihte* and *rihtlice* (*op. cit.*, pp. 51 ff.), sometimes within the same sentence, as in Alfred's *Pastoral Care*, 176. 11 (*op. cit.*, p. 52), already quoted by me. At times, too, the superlative of a Latin adverb (*manifestissime*) is translated by the form in *-lice* (*sweetollice*), as in Alfred's *Bede*, 639. 2025 (*op. cit.*, p. 55).

It is unfortunate, I think, that Dr. Uhler takes next to no account of this idiom in Old English poetry, and that he does not give full citations for his construction in the large number of Old English prose works investigated by him. And a statistical table, not, as given by him, of a few words only, but of all the words considered by him, would be helpful.

But, despite these shortcomings, this monograph is a sound piece of work, distinguished by clarity of statement and of arrangement and by sanity of judgment. Dr. Uhler has made highly probable his thesis that these adjectives and adverbs have substantially the same meaning whether with or without the suffix (*-lic*, *-lice*).

University of Texas.

MORGAN CALLAWAY, JR.

Two American Pioneers—Seba Smith and Elizabeth Oakes Smith.

By MARY ALICE WYMAN, Ph. D. New York: Columbia University Press, 1927. viii + 249 pp. \$3.00.

In addition to providing (pp. 233-242) a very full and apparently accurate Bibliography of the numerous writings of Mr. and Mrs. Seba Smith, once of Portland, Maine, and later of New York City, this volume by Miss Wyman serves two useful purposes. It further illustrates the international nature of literature, and it helps to fill in the background behind our more prominent nineteenth century American writers.

The influence of *Junius* of mysterious British fame upon *The Life and Writings of Major Jack Downing of Downingville, away Down East in the State of Maine* (1833) is properly emphasized; and, with the chronological arrangement interestingly reversed, Mrs. Smith's antecendence of Ibsen's *Doll's House* by over twenty-five years is demonstrated. From 1825 for over forty years, Mr. and Mrs. Seba Smith, in American newspapers, magazines, and books, followed, echoed, and at times preceded, European literary styles, fashions, thoughts, and schools, in a way that obliterates all national boundaries. As Miss Wyman remarks, "in their connections with important people and movements of their day, they open up an interesting chapter of a period that has passed." Accounts of the contacts with Emerson and Thoreau, and of the relations with Edgar Allan Poe, are all valuable minor additions to American literary history.

In dealing with the two pioneers themselves, Miss Wyman preserves a commendably humble judgment of their worth, and frankly speaks of "needing a searchlight in surveying the group of minor writers in Portland"; and not often does she fall into the habit too common among those who write about less significant figures, of padding her pages with extraneous but more readable material. Yet, after stating that "Seba Smith admits that he himself was not at the dinner" given in New York to Charles Dickens in 1842, she includes an account of the dinner, of the decorations of the Park Theatre, and of Philip Hone and "the nine cheers from nearly three thousand throats." Ought Dickens be forced to supply background for a man who "was not at the dinner"? Nor is the attempt made to establish any unwarranted claims for literary merit in the works of either. Seba's output is frankly admitted to be weak in form and structure, and the London *Anthenaeum* (Jan. 6, 1849) is quoted without contradiction to the effect that "love of the tawdry seems to have infected American writers. Mrs. Oakes Smith is thoroughly in the fashion." Miss Wyman's care in giving an accurate account of the two Maine literary pioneers is well illustrated by the story of the Downing letters, and by her history of the resuscitation in 1840 of Major Downing, who, like Sir Roger de Coverley, had been killed by his author.

Many of the most interesting passages in the life of Mrs. Smith are given in her own words, taken from *Selections from the Autobiography of Elizabeth Oakes Smith*. This little-known book (161 pp.), edited by Miss Wyman, and published (1924) by the Lewiston Journal Company, of Lewiston, Maine, contains three illustrations showing Mrs. Smith at various ages. The *Autobiography* naturally furnishes more entertaining reading than the *Two American Pioneers*.

CARL J. WEBER.

Colby College.

A Chaucer Handbook. By ROBERT DUDLEY FRENCH, New York, 1927. Pp. xi, 394.

Chaucer. By GEORGE H. COWLING, London, 1927. Pp. viii, 223.

Chaucer and the Mediaeval Sciences. By WALTER CLYDE CURRY, New York, 1926. Pp. xxii, 267.

Chaucer: The Nun's Priest's Tale. Edited KENNETH SISAM, Oxford, 1927. Pp. xlv, 82.

One who sets out to write a handbook of Chaucer has a rather difficult choice to make. He may follow Pollard or Root or Wells in simply stating the facts as straightforwardly as is consistent with readability, or Kittredge in combining criticism and scholarship. Professor French writes (as he says) for the "mature student of Chaucer,"—writes agreeably, but deprecates "æsthetic criticism," and so risks the disappointment both of scholars and of critics. For example, he has nearly four pages on the *Hous of Fame*, of which only one page touches the really important question: what the poem is actually about. He restates the theory of Immelmann (whose theories are usually wrong) and that of Manly, and quotes Sypherd at some length. He adds nothing for the mature student. He covers the intricate problem of the two Prologues of the Legend in eight or ten sentences. He devotes fifty-six pages to the *Troilus*, all but two of which are on the sources (mainly a very full summary of the *Filostrato*), and offers the mature student no helps of general criticism, maugre the æsthetic. The paragraph on Lollius must have been written before Professor Kittredge's thorough study (1917), though the latter is listed in the Bibliography. In a word, the *Handbook* is proper for an undergraduate class in Chaucer; the more mature student will want something more substantial.

Professor Cowling apparently wishes to popularize his poet. He is of course acquainted with the scholarship of his subject, and he refers wittily to "some modern academic investigators." But his book is full of unexpected statements, such as that the *Troilus* "is the only long poem which the poet ever completed to his own satisfaction" (pp. 112-13), or that "*Troilus and Criseyde* is not a book for the young" (p. 118). He finds that "in the absence of the evidence of facts, it is profitable to linger" over such speculations as "How Chaucer resolved to be poet" (p. 76), suggests that *Sir Thopas* ridicules one of Chaucer's own "early efforts," and submits an imaginary dialogue between Froissart and Chaucer, "however inadequately" written (in the best manner of Sir Walter). There are worse things in the book than these, and some which are better. The time-honored misconception of Milton's "simple, sensuous, and passionate" dictum is repeated with fresh

variations, and there is a considerable effort made to demonstrate that Chaucer was a poet; but the discussion of the *Troilus*, though brief, is interesting, the running account of the *Canterbury Tales* is adequate for the 'popular' reader, and the closing pages contain some sound (on the whole) if not brilliant criticism.

The reprinting, with amplifications, of Professor Curry's recent articles makes a convenient little book, though one must insist that what should have been footnotes have been maliciously printed as an appendix; and that the omission of an index of names and subjects, and of passages annotated is a serious error which greatly diminishes the usefulness of the work. Much of the volume is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of Chaucer's familiarity with the mediaeval sciences and his frequent use of them. Other portions are open to question. Chaucer's description of the Pardoner, for instance, as beardless and high-voiced and under suspicion of being "a gelding or a mare" Professor Curry takes as a text for discussing the ancient and mediaeval beliefs concerning *eunuchi ex nativitate*, virtually identifies the Pardoner with a certain Favorinus of Arles (known to students of Lucian), and proceeds to a new interpretation of the famous psychological crux at the end of the Tale. Interesting, but still less persuasive is his presentation of the Wife of Bath as the embodiment of a horoscope: it is one thing to use astrology for illustration, it is quite another to put the cart before the horse. There is not space here to argue, however; and Professor Curry does put forward his contentions with all due modesty.

Mr. Sisam's school-text of the *Nun's Priest's Tale* is eminent in all respects for its practical usefulness, its attractive make-up (the presswork, however, leaves something to be desired), and its common-sense treatment of many questions both fundamental and incidental,—notably the choice of matters to present to beginners, the discussion of Chaucer's relation to his source, the technical handling of the text, the healthy emphasis on Chaucer as a narrative rather than a "dramatic" poet, and the attention given to those pitfalls of translation due to the deceptive similarity between fourteenth-century word-meanings and modern usage.

Duke University.

PAULL F. BAUM.

Songs from the British Drama. Edited by EDWARD BLISS REED.
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925. 386 pp. \$4.00.

Professor Reed's volume is a scholarly anthology; from this fact spring both its virtues and defects. It offers more than we have a right to expect from an anthology at the same time that it gives us less than we hope for from a comprehensive study. The error, if there be one, lies in the plan of the book. After a fairly inclusive

selection from the Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists, the space allotted to individual authors sensibly diminishes. The quality of the songs diminishes also, but surely room might have been found for more than one of Congreve's polished lyrics. A graver lack appears in the material following Sheridan: only 15 pages out of the total 254 are devoted to drama from 1780 to the present day, and a selection which omits *Manfred* and *The Cenci* is hardly representative. Would it not have been better to have concluded the volume at an earlier date and given a more complete view of the authors represented?

The possible chronological limits might have been difficult to fix, because of the arrangement adopted by Professor Reed. His method of listing the poems in accordance with the date of the author's birth results in such a misleading order as Tennyson, Browning, Gilbert and in including Sir Walter Raleigh's song, "Now what is love I pray thee tell," sixty pages before the work of Thomas Heywood, in whose play it occurs. A clearer and no less logical order would have been to regard the date of each author's earliest contribution to drama rather than the year of his birth.

The arrangement and selection of material is not of importance, if one considers the volume as a personal anthology instead of as an attempt to survey the field of British drama. It is in the latter capacity, however, that Professor Reed's work is of most significance. He has unearthed a number of unfamiliar lyrics, especially from masques and entertainments, which deserve to be better known. His notes are reliable and give exactly the information that is most useful and illuminating. His essay on "Some Aspects of Song in Drama" raises some interesting questions and suggests intelligent answers to them. Altogether his book is the best contribution yet made to the provocative problem of the use of songs in English dramatic literature.

HENRY TEN EYCK PERRY.

University of Buffalo.

The Shelley Correspondence in the Bodleian Library. Edited by R. H. HILL. Printed for the Bodleian Library, Oxford, 1926. Pp. xv + 48.

Within the covers of this slight but highly important contribution to Shelley literature, prepared under the thoroughly capable editorship of Mr. R. H. Hill, of the Bodleian Library staff, are published completely, for the first time, all but five of the unpublished letters and portions of letters of Shelley, Mary, Godwin, and others of the Shelley circle, given to the Bodleian in 1892 by Jane,

Lady Shelley. Under the conditions of her bequest, these were not to be published until July 8, 1922, the centenary of Shelley's death. The present publication is the result of the combined labors of The Merton Professor of English Literature (Professor George Stuart Gordon), Professor H. F. B. Brett-Smith, and Mr. Hill, all of whom examined the original holographs and in the case of those which had been previously published, compared them with the published versions, and noted all differences.

Probably the most important letter in the series is that on the subject of Richard Carlile's trial, which Shelley wrote to Leigh Hunt, November 3, 1819. Only the first and third sheets of this letter of five sheets had been previously published. This essay on the freedom of the press is one of a series by Shelley on this topic, the earliest being the *Letter to Lord Ellenborough*, 1812, the next, the *Refutation of Deism*, 1814, and the lately-discovered "Letters to the Friends of Freedom and Philanthropy" in *Hone's Reformer's Register*, June 14, 1817 and August 9, 1817, possibly two sequels, from the same hand.

It is regrettable that the contents of five letters which Shelley wrote to Byron, and of which transcripts in Lady Dorchester's hand are to be found in the Bodleian Mss., could not also be published. In 1882, when Sir Percy and Lady Jane Shelley issued the texts of many of the Shelley letters then in their possession, in a limited edition entitled "Shelley and Mary," Lady Dorchester, because of the Claire Clairmont-Allegria Byron material in those letters, demanded the withdrawal of the book from circulation under a threat that she would not speak to Lady Shelley again. With that threat she sent Lady Shelley transcripts of some letters written by Shelley to Byron, letters then in her possession. To the contents of one of the letters then in her hands (but whether this was one of the five in the Bodleian collection I cannot say) I have referred in *Shelley: His Life and Work* (1927).

In addition to the texts of the letters, which Mr. Hill publishes for the first time or in a corrected, complete form for the first time, he has furnished a concise and admirable preface, and an extremely useful census of the entire series of 229 letters in the Collection, recording their original publication, whether it was complete, correct, etc. All of the amended texts, and all of the new letters, have, since the appearance of Mr. Hill's book, been included in the new ten-volume Julian edition of Shelley's *Complete Works* (Correspondence, vols. VIII, IX, X) published in the United States by Charles Scribner's Sons.

WALTER EDWIN PECK.

Hunter College of the City of New York.

Anglo-Dutch Relations from the Earliest Times to the Death of William the Third, Being an Historical Introduction to a Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary. By J. F. BENSE. Oxford University Press, 1925. \$5.50.

This well-printed, interesting volume is in some ways a curious work. Of three hundred or more pages nearly a third are devoted to an index excessively full. The numerous footnotes, given with severe restraint, are mostly no more than numerals and letters: "P." turns out to be the *Diary* of Pepys, "P. L." is for Gairdner's edition of the *Paston Letters*, "L." is for W. S. Lindsay's *History of Merchant Shipping and Ancient Commerce* (London, 1874), "W." represents Jan de Vries, *De Wikingen in de Lage Landen bij de Zee* (Haarlem, 1923), and "te W." is for J. te Winkel's *De Ontwikkelingsgang der Nederlandsche Letterkunde* (Haarlem, 1908). Very erudite readers may not be obliged to refer frequently to the list of abbreviations prefixed, but from the annotations all possible color and beauty has been taken. On the other hand, in some instances excellence of the critical apparatus turns out to be apparent rather than real, for the author, although he uses the Skeat edition of *Piers the Plowman*, cites a less good edition of Chaucer, and uses the Everyman's Library reprint of Stow's *Survey of London*, and the statement "Holland was 'then [third century] holden by certaine Frankes'" is based solely on a seventeenth-century edition of Stow's *Annales or Generall Chronicle of England*.

Dr. Bense has undertaken the large task of compiling a *Dictionary of Low-Dutch Words in English*. What he intended to be an introductory chapter narrating the history of intercourse between England and the Netherlands grew to such dimensions as to require this separate, preliminary volume. With wealth of specific information he recounts successive waves of Dutch and Flemish immigration into England from the eleventh to the end of the seventeenth century; he describes the close trade relations, the contact between Dutch and English fishermen, the development of some industries in England by men from the Netherlands, how English and Dutch soldiers many times fought side by side, how religious refugees came from England to the Low Countries and from the Netherlands to England; and he shows how all these factors aided in causing effect of one speech upon the other, detailing the influence of Dutch literature, culture, and art upon English people and the enrichment of the English language by borrowings from the cognate tongue. The book affords additional light for the study of language growth, while historians will find in it interesting data not elsewhere assembled.

RAYMOND TURNER.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Swift, Les années de jeunesse et le "Conte du Tonneau." Par Dr. EMILE PONS. Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 1925. (Imported by the Oxford University Press.)

Dr. Pons is already known as the author of "Le Thème et le Sentiment de la Nature dans la Poésie Anglo-Saxonne." His present book is an elaborate, penetrating, and judicious account of Swift's formative years. Without advancing new documentary evidence or startling theories, he skillfully sorts and utilizes all the vast supply of source-materials and biographers' interpretations which have accumulated on the subject. His prolegomenous classification and appraisal (105 large pages) is a model of its kind. He thoroughly examines and discredits the "secret marriage" to Stella and the "angry visit" to Vanessa.

His narrative of Swift's life to the year 1704 supports the belief that Stella (but not Swift) was an illegitimate child of Sir William Temple; renders more justice to Temple's behavior toward Swift than is usually accorded; shows the significance of the Scotch Presbyterians at Kilroot as prototypes for Swift's portrayals of Dissenters; and builds up a sane and fairly coherent view of the satirist's personality. We are not asked to believe that Swift was a petulant highwayman or a glorified street-cleaner: the tiger's claws are not pared.

Enthusiasm, however, seems to permeate Dr. Pons when he criticizes the *Tale of a Tub*. That work exhibits, he says, "une impeccable ordonnance, en dépit des arrêts simulés, des interruptions, des digressions: tous les prétendus obstacles auront leur utilité, mais le fil des événements ne sera de leur fait ni distendu, ni rompu." Discounting these hyperboles, we can still feel that the critic has rightly appreciated the depth and governing influence of the central "clothes-philosophy." He furnishes an interesting array of sartorial metaphors and satiric allusions in English literature prior to the *Tale*.

H. M. DARGAN.

Dartmouth College.

BRIEF MENTION

A History of French Literature from the earliest times to the present. By W. A. NITZE and E. P. DARGAN. Revised edition. New York, Holt, 1927. xi + 818 pp. This edition is new in three respects. Corrections of minor points, many of them suggested by reviewers, have been made in the body of the book; pp. 720-738, dealing with literature of the twentieth century, have been

expanded to fill pp. 723-770; the bibliography has been revised and brought up to date. The book has thus been rendered more serviceable than ever to students of French literature.

H. C. L.

A Preface to Molière. By H. ASHTON. New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1927. xi + 177 pp. Intended for advanced undergraduates, this book, profusely illustrated, gives an interesting and correct account of Molière's life, his discussion of social questions, and the manners and customs of Paris in his day.

H. C. L.

Louise Labé, sa vie et son œuvre. Par DOROTHY O'CONNOR. Paris dissertation. Abbeville, Paillart, 1926. A useful book, especially for its biographical information. While Dr. O'C. does not dispute Calvin's verdict that Louise was a *plebeia meretrix*, she fortunately does not on this account fail to treat her justly both as a woman and as a poet. She finds that Petrarch was her chief model and that she owed little to her French predecessors. One can only admire the industry with which the subject has been investigated, but one regrets that the author does not show a more thorough acquaintance with French verse of the sixteenth century, as shown by her uninformed account of the introduction of the sonnet into France (cf. Villey, *RHL.*, xxvii, 538-547, and Bullock, *MLN.*, xxxix, 475-478) and her superficial and partly incorrect discussion of her heroine's versification. The proof-reading could have been improved in several cases, but the only serious blunder I have noted is her dating Perneti's work a century too soon on p. 44.

H. C. L.

A Census of British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1620-1800. By R. S. CRANE and F. B. KAYE, with the assistance of M. E. PRIOR. University of North Carolina Press, 1927. 205 pp. This admirable finding list (which is reprinted from *Studies in Philology*, January, 1927) includes 2426 items arranged alphabetically according to titles followed by valuable chronological and geographical indices. There is no index of editors or contributors. The most unusual feature of the work (which would be notable even without it) is that it tells in what American libraries what numbers of each periodical may be found—except for the 1445 journals that are not to be found here at all! The second edition, which is in active preparation, will furnish the same information for the chief

libraries of Great Britain and a fuller treatment of printers, editors, and the like. Since nothing is more needed for the study of the eighteenth-century than reliable bibliographies of *genres* and of minor authors, it is fortunate that a work so useful and so laborious as this should have been done by scholars of such unusual thoroughness and accuracy.

R. D. H.

Gray, Poetry and Prose, with Essays by Johnson, Goldsmith, and others, with an Introduction and Notes by J. CROFTS. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Pp. xii + 176. Following the general plan of the Clarendon Series, the editor prefixes to the selections a series of critical passages arranged so as to give a brief history of Gray's reputation.

A. D. MCKILLOP.

The Formal Eclogue in Eighteenth-Century England. By MARION K. BRAGG. University of Maine Studies, Second Series, No. 6. Orono, Maine: University Press, 1926. Pp. xi + 147. This study, elaborately planned and industriously carried out, suggests certain interesting questions about the pastoral *genre* which can hardly be answered adequately within the limits of a Master's thesis. How far did the pastoral in the strict classical tradition turn into something else, and how far did it simply atrophy? Was it rejected or was it developed? Miss Bragg at times speaks of the formal eclogue as destroyed by romanticism, and at other times as evolving into romanticism. But her project required that she stay pretty close to the old rather than the new, and carried her farther and farther from the main line of development. In this connection the results—on the whole negative—of Broughton's careful study of Theocritus and Wordsworth (not mentioned in the present monograph) are significant.

A. D. MCKILLOP.

A Critical Medley: Essays, Studies, and Notes in English, French, and Comparative Literature. By ERIC PARTRIDGE. Paris: Champion, 1926. Pp. 226. Mr. Partridge gives us undistinguished discussions of various topics, which yield such conclusions as these: "Other things being equal, the morality of literature decides its ultimate value" (p. 14). "Marlowe's versification is not only wonderful in itself, but also of the greatest significance in the

evolution of our drama" (p. 18). "Vicesimus Knox has not the polish of Addison, the ease of Chesterfield, but he belongs quite definitely to his age" (p. 54). The last essay, "The Comparative Study of Literature," contains a useful survey of discussions of the comparative method.

A. D. MCKILLOP.

Pour le centenaire du romantisme, un examen de conscience. By ERNEST SEILLIÈRE (Paris: Librairie Champion, 1927. 8°. 315 pp.). On the occasion of the centenary of Romanticism, which France celebrated last year, M. Ernest Seillière has written this book to sound again a note of warning. The baron is known as a bitter adversary of Romanticism and all its works. What repels him in this movement, is not its æsthetics, but its politics. He finds that Romanticism has had a nefarious effect on international relations. His contention is that individualism, which is the very crux and kernel of Romanticism, has also produced imperialism. The spirit of egoism, which the Romantics exalted and cultivated, brought about, so he thinks, an instinct of domination in the mutual relations of nations as well as of individuals. M. Seillière never tires of warning us against the always menacing danger of Romantic imperialism. If Germany attracted his attention in particular, it is not on account of any philosophic or artistic predilection for that country, but for the reason that of all European countries, Germany, in his opinion, represents, or represented in its monarchic days, the most menacing form of this Romantic and mystic imperialism. The work of M. Seillière is always stimulating, though not always convincing.¹

M. RUDWIN.

¹For further study of this interesting and untiring author (he has already to his credit about fifty books and over a hundred articles), the reader is referred to J. M. L. Bourdeau's book, *Ernest Seillière, historien du mysticisme romantique* (Paris: Emil-Paul, 1925). The German counterpart of Baron Seillière is Schmitt-Dorotic, author of *Politische Romantik* (Leipzig).

